

Volume XII OCTOBER, 1913 Number 4

The South Atlantic Quarterly

New Stories of Lee and Jackson*

A. R. H. RANSON

Late Major of Artillery, Confederate States Army

I

STORIES OF GENERAL LEE

After the Gettysburg campaign the Army of Northern Virginia took up its position in Culpepper county, Virginia, where it was immediately confronted by the Army of the Potomac under General Meade. As General Longstreet's corps had been detached and had been sent to reinforce General Bragg at Chickamauga, General Lee with only two army corps was in no condition to attack, and General Meade seemed also not disposed to advance. The two armies were simply watching each other. At this juncture of affairs an officer in command of our forces in the Valley of Virginia got news of the movement of large bodies of troops from the West by train to the East, sent by General Grant to reinforce General Meade and enable him to drive General Lee into Richmond.

Thomas D. Ranson, a young soldier in the cavalry, was selected as bearer of dispatches communicating this very important information to General Lee. He was instructed to ride at full speed and to impress relays of horses as fast as his mount broke down. He obeyed instructions, stopping only to change saddles from his broken-down mount to a fresh one, and made the ride of more than a hundred miles in the shortest possible time. When he arrived at General Lee's headquarters it was midnight, and General Lee was in bed and asleep. Young Ranson immediately

*Major Ranson was one of General Lee's staff officers. He published in *Harper's Magazine* for February, 1911, a noteworthy article containing his reminiscences of General Lee. It now gives pleasure to the editors of the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY* to publish Major Ranson's additional reminiscences of Lee and also his reminiscences of General Jackson. Copyright, 1913, by A. R. H. Ranson, and all rights reserved.

entered the general's tent, and, awakening him, announced his errand.

General Lee lit a candle and read the dispatches sitting up in bed. Then, asking for the particulars of the young soldier's ride and looking at him and seeing his exhausted condition, the general arose from his bed and compelled the unwilling young man to get into it, and, covering him up with his blankets, told him to go to sleep. General Lee then dressed himself and sat up in his chair until morning.

In the winter of 1864-5, when our army was defending the line from Petersburg to Richmond, I came into camp one evening, after a hard day's work, and found my bed occupied by a young man covered up in my blankets. He was a stranger to me, and I asked the servants the meaning of it. They said he had asked only for Major Ranson's tent, and forthwith had entered and taken possession.

As his face was very red, and as he was sleeping so heavily that I could not awake him, I concluded he had been drinking, although there was no smell of whisky. I sent for Dr. Gild, medical director of the army, who decided that he was not drunk but in typhoid fever. He also had awakened him long enough to learn that he was my nephew John, sixteen years old, whom I had not seen for twelve years. He had come all the way from California to join the army, walking the last 250 miles.

In this dilemma, I went to General Lee. He said promptly: "Enlist him in some battery, and then Dr. Gild can send him to the hospital in Peterburg." This was done, and when spring came John appeared again at my camp. He had gone to the hospital a chubby boy, and was now a tall gaunt man, and voraciously hungry.

As my ration, one-quarter pound of bacon and one pound of flour, was hardly enough for one, I went again to General Lee. He said as promptly as before: "Leave his name and battery with me, and I will order him to report to you as courier, when he can draw his own rations. When he regains his strength, he must go back to duty with his battery." As I had come down from three horses to one on account of scarcity of forage, and therefore could not mount him, John became my courier on foot, the only one I have ever heard of.

About a week after the surrender at Appomattox, General Lee started for his home, accompanied by several of his staff. A company of Federal cavalry had been ordered to escort him to his home. On the first day's ride, General Lee came upon a squad of Confederate soldiers on their way home, resting by the roadside. Stopping and asking where they were going and learning they were from the lower end of the Valley of Virginia, 250 miles distant, and belonged to the Stonewall Brigade, he took out his pocket map and directed them by the shortest and best roads to their homes. Next, bidding them good-bye, he told them they must now be as good and faithful as citizens as they had been as soldiers.

Then, turning to the officer commanding the escort, he said: "Captain, you see I am in my own county and among friends and do not need an escort. I am giving unnecessary trouble and now request you to withdraw your men and rejoin your command." The captain at once went to the rear with his men and left General Lee to go his way unguarded.

General Lee never indulged in the pomp and circumstance of war; his staff was with him always in battle but seldom on any other occasions. He generally in his rides was accompanied by a single courier to hold his horse in case he wished to dismount. For a great general with so extensive a command his staff was the most modest as to rank of any I have known. While the generals of the Federal army had major generals and brigadier generals in abundance as staff officers, not one at General Lee's headquarters had a rank above lieutenant colonel.

Taylor, Marshall, and Venable of his personal staff; Baldwin, chief of ordinance; Cole, chief quartermaster; Corley, chief commissary; Murray, inspector general, were all lieutenant colonels, and Young, judge advocate general, was major. During the winter, 1864-5, without request of General Lee all of these lieutenant colonels were promoted to full colonels. Young became lieutenant colonel, and I became major, but, through some neglect or oversight in the Adjutant General's office in Richmond, the commissions were not forwarded to General Lee and the order of promotion was therefore never published. However, some of these officers drew their pay for the advanced grade.

In the summer of 1867 my wife went to White Sulphur Springs

with her mother, and they occupied a cottage adjoining General Lee's. The general was still wearing his Confederate uniform which had seen so much service in the war, and rode his horse Traveller daily over the mountain paths.

There was much porch visiting between the two families, and one day, while sitting on the porch with my wife, unsolicited and without remark General Lee took out his pocket knife, and cutting off one of the buttons from his coat, gave it to her. In a former article on General Lee, I have told that while standing in the crowded aisle of the church at Orange Court House, Va., my wife had pressed up close behind General Lee and had taken hold of one of the buttons on his coat, and, when asked to explain the act, had said: "I did not think that you or anyone saw it. I merely wished to be able to say, when I went home, that I had touched the hem of his garment."

Now, as I am quite sure that General Lee had no knowledge whatever of the incident at Orange Court House, the coincidence is very singular. At any rate the button came to us at last, and we have it now tied with a blue ribbon on which is written, "Button from General Lee's coat, White Sulphur, August, 1867."

During that summer two Englishmen with their families came to the Springs, attracted by General Lee's presence there. They made his acquaintance and were frequently seen with him in his walks about the place. One day my wife, knowing his aversion to all notoriety, his horror of hero worship, asked the general if these people were not a trouble to him. He said: "Yes, they trouble me a little, but I think I get even with them. When they join me in my walks, I always take them down to the Springs and make them drink the water. They are too polite to refuse, when I hand them the glasses, and I fill them up with that nauseous water, and thus have my revenge."

The wife of one of these Englishmen asked my wife to try and induce General Lee to notice her baby and if possible touch him with his hand. One day General Lee came upon the nurse in the grounds and going up to her took the baby from her and carried it a little way in his arms. The delighted mother, looking on from a distance, exclaimed: "Oh, think what it will mean to my boy when he grows up to be a man, and I tell him General Lee once held him in his arms!"

Mr. Bradford in the *Atlantic Monthly* tells a story of a mother at the White Sulphur, who said to General Lee, "I am bringing up my boy to love the South," and General Lee replied, "Madam, you must do more than that; you must bring him up to love his country."

There was an incident of equal flavor when there came to the Springs that summer a man from West Virginia with his daughter. The man had been a Union man during the war and had remained at home and made a fortune, while the men in the South had gone into the army and had lost all they had. The daughter was very beautiful and very attractive and was more handsomely dressed than any woman at the Springs. But the women would have none of her, and the men, though they would have liked to show her some attention, followed the example of the women from simple fear of their disapprobation, and the girl was very lonely.

One evening, when all the people had gone to the ball, General Lee, in passing through one of the parlors, saw the girl sitting alone by a lamp reading, and going up to her introduced himself and asked for the honor of taking her into the ballroom. Entering the ballroom with the girl on his arm, he joined the gay throng in the grand promenade which always preceded the dancing. When the promenade was over and General Lee led the girl to a seat, there was a general rush for introductions, and from that time on the girl not only had all the partners she wanted but actually became the belle of the season.

There is a great deal of talking on the part of our great men of the day. General Lee was not a talker. He generally talked to only one person when he did talk, never to an audience, and never sermonized; and yet the silent and dignified walk of the man through the world, his purity of character, his devotion to duty, his entire forgetfulness of self and his kindly thoughtfulness of others, present to us a sermon far more eloquent and effective than any we may hear from pulpit or platform.

II.

STORIES OF GENERAL JACKSON

Major Jackson came to Lexington and reported for duty at the Virginia Military Institute in 1849, after the close of the War

with Mexico, in which he had distinguished himself as an officer in artillery of the United States Army.

I was a cadet at the time, but, being in the graduating class with which Major Jackson had no duties, I knew him only by sight. I saluted him of course as my superior officer whenever I met him, but I never spoke to him. The cadets had much to say about him, especially the plebes who were very critical. A plebe will criticize anything or anybody. Much has been said about hazing, but moderate hazing is good for a plebe. It is a good thing for a man young or old to learn who he is and what he is, and a plebe must be taught that lesson or he will burst with pride when he beholds himself for the first time in uniform. The foundation of a soldier is subordination of self to authority, unquestioning obedience; and hazing is the beginning of the lesson.

The plebes said Major Jackson was stupid, dull, half asleep. When I saw him in his walks about barracks, he seemed absorbed, his head bent, and his hands often clasped behind his back. He had neither the figure, air, or bearing of a West Point soldier, and this was disappointing to cadets, who prided themselves on their soldierly appearance. What sort of a figure he made as a professor or teacher I have no means of knowing, as I graduated and left the Institute in July, 1849, and did not see him again until the war.

In April, 1861, I was stationed at Harper's Ferry as adjutant of the Second Virginia Infantry, a crack regiment. We were quartered in the buildings in the armory yard and used the grounds for drill, dress parade, and guard mounting, which were our only duties. Time hung heavy on our hands.

One afternoon about four o'clock the long roll was suddenly beaten on orders received by me from headquarters of Colonel Jackson, commanding the forces at Harper's Ferry. The men were in their quarters sleeping, reading and playing cards, amusing themselves after the fashion of idle soldiers in barracks. They came tumbling out in five minutes one thousand strong, all armed and equipped in light marching order, with forty rounds of ammunition to the man.

When I had formed the regiment in line I found that the colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major were all absent. Just then Colonel Jackson rode up and asked, "What regiment?" I replied, "Second

Virginia." "Where is the colonel?" "Absent." "Lieutenant colonel?" "Absent." "The major?" "Absent." "Take the regiment out on the Shepherdstown road."

I put the regiment in motion, and then ran back to Colonel Jackson and asked: "What are we to do when we get on the Shepherdstown road?" "Take the regiment out on the Shepherdstown road; that is enough for you, sir." I was returning to the regiment when he called out to me: "Pursue the road until you meet the enemy."

Here was news which broke the monotony. I hurried to the head of the regiment and put the senior captain in command and repeated Colonel Jackson's words to him. We halted and threw out an advance guard and flankers, and then pursued the road through a terrific thunder storm, arriving at Shepherdstown about nine o'clock. Finding the bridge over the Potomac safe and no enemy in sight, we returned to Harper's Ferry—after having been refreshed with coffee served by the girls—arriving about sunrise the next morning.

I think Colonel Jackson was merely giving us a practice march.

In December, 1861, I was in Winchester and Brigadier General Jackson (then "Stonewall," a soubriquet given him by General Lee at Manassas, when he said to his men to encourage them, "Look at Jackson's Brigade, standing like a stone wall"), was there in command of all the troops in the Valley.

Hearing that while a prisoner at Beverly, West Virginia, in June, 1861, and in bad health, his sister, Mrs. Arnold, had taken me into her house out of the Federal hospital which was filled with typhoid, and had cared for me until I recovered my health, he expressed a wish to see me. I called on him on a Sunday, and, sending in my name, was ushered in. He was quartered in one of the old fashioned dwellings of the town, and the room in which he had established himself as headquarters was scantily furnished and comfortless in appearance. There were a table, a camp desk, and two or three wooden chairs. On the table was one book, a Bible. The desk was closed, and not a scrap of paper was anywhere visible.

The general was standing with his back to the fire when I entered. He was extraordinarily well dressed. I think he had on his old blue professor's coat and a clean "biled" shirt, and his

boots had been blacked. He advanced to meet me with a quick movement, and seemed to me to be on the point of being effusive, a trait I had never heard of his possessing. However, he confined himself to shaking my hand so long that I did not know how to get it away from him, and the situation was becoming embarrassing to me, when he espied my cap in my other hand. This he seized at once, and, after we had both tugged at it for a while, I surrendered it. But when he got it he did not seem to know what to do with it. Looking all around the room and seeing no nail or hook to hang it on, he walked to the mantelpiece, a high old-fashioned wooden one, with figures in relief on it, and placed it carefully exactly in the center.

Returning to me he asked me to be seated, and then asked me about his sister. There was not much to say. I told him of her kindness to me and of my thankfulness, and that seemed to me to be the end of it, particularly as he asked no questions; in fact, remained perfectly silent.

As I was at the end of my subject and had only been with him a few minutes, I began to tell him something of the campaign in West Virginia which had ended so disastrously. I thought he would be interested as a soldier, and particularly as the campaign had been in his own neighborhood and he was therefore familiar with the features of the country, but I did not get very far into my story before I saw a far away look in his face which I recognized as an unfailing sign that he was not listening, and I immediately got up from my seat to take leave of him.

There had been so much ceremony attending my entrance that I supposed there would be more or less of it at my departure, but I was mistaken. He seemed to be absorbed in something foreign to this interview. I think he had forgotten who I was, and why I had called. He sat still in his chair and allowed me unmolested to take my cap from the mantelpiece; then, rising and following me silently to the door, bowed and closed it behind me.

In this entire interview the only words spoken by General Jackson were, "Be seated," and "Tell me about my sister." He spoke no word of greeting as I entered the room, he asked no question, and he spoke no word at my departure. The interview had not lasted more than ten minutes; I had said nothing of his sister except that she was in good health when I saw her and had been

very kind. I had said nothing of the Rich Mountain fight except as to the utter defencelessness of the position from a strategic standpoint, things which I thought would interest any soldier, and yet in those few minutes he had changed from an almost effusive host to an absorbed and indifferent superior officer, and I have never become sufficiently acquainted with his character to account satisfactorily to myself for the change.

It has been suggested that I had broken his sabbatarian rules; but he had sent for me on Sunday, had admitted me on Sunday, after my card had been given him, and had been more than cordial in his manner (not in words, for there were none) at the outset. Of course, there is an explanation, and men who were familiar with him, lived with him, and knew him well, will possibly be able to give it. But, as I had only three interviews with him in his whole life, it must remain a mystery to me until an explanation is given me.

In 1862 I had my third and last interview with General Jackson. I had reported for duty to General Lee on the field of the battle of Sharpsburg. The general told me he had work for me at his headquarters and would give me my written orders the next day, and that I must come back to his headquarters for them.

The army recrossed the Potomac that night, and I found his headquarters about four miles northwest of Shepherdstown early the next morning. While Colonel Chilton was preparing the orders for the day in the Adjutant General's tent, which had an opening out of General Lee's tent, I waited in General Lee's tent for more than two hours. His tent was pitched in a peach orchard, and the farmer had brought him a hamper of peaches, more than a bushel. Lieutenant-General Jackson came up on foot, looking much like a rugged old farmer himself, and bringing with him a soldier. He accosted General Lee, saying he had brought him a prisoner. General Jackson was standing outside the tent with his prisoner, and General Lee went out and took a look at the pair, and smiling said: "What is the man's offence?" "Stealing peaches." General Lee told the man to help himself out of his basket and go back to his command.

General Lee, after the man had gone, came back into the tent and went on with his business of dictating orders to Colonel Chilton. General Jackson sat down on a camp stool at the door

of the tent beside the basket of peaches, and, taking out an old clasp knife, he proceeded to peel and eat more peaches than I believed any man could eat.

Since I had last seen him in Winchester in 1861, he had conducted his brilliant campaign in the Valley, had taken part in the battles of Malvern Hill, Cedar Mountain, and Second Manassas, had compelled the surrender of Harper's Ferry with ten thousand men and seventy-five pieces of artillery, and had then taken part in the second day's fighting at Sharpsburg.

At Winchester he was quite well dressed, but now no one would have taken him for a general officer. His clothes were faded and soiled until they were the color of the ground, and his boots were the same. His face was sunburnt and his beard unkempt; his grey cap scarcely covered the top of his head, did not shade his nose, and was the same color as his soiled and faded uniform.

Sitting at the door of General Lee's tent and peeling and eating peaches, I do not believe he was conscious of what he was doing; for he seemed absorbed in something else and talked the whole time with General Lee about the military situation and outlook. Then it was I began to know that he was not a mere blunderer (as many had supposed early in the war), but that under his most unmilitary appearance there was concealed the acme of military courage—stronger in defeat than in victory, and a mind wholly absorbed in a soldier's work.

My old home was only four miles distant, and I thought I knew every path about me, but, in following Jackson's plans and the disposition of his corps, I found that he knew more of the features of the neighborhood than I did—that every ford on the river was guarded and every arrangement made to crush McClellan should he attempt to cross, and that the slouching, ill-dressed figure quietly peeling peaches was the great corps commander and brilliant strategist of the war. I also found out something then which was afterward an especial explanation to me of General Lee's words to Jackson after he had fallen at Chancellorsville by the fearful error of his own men: "General, you have lost your left arm but I have lost my right arm." For in that long interview there was not one suggestion made by General Jackson concerning the disposition of the whole army which was not accepted by General Lee and at once communicated to Colonel Chilton to be incorporated in the orders for the day.

After being present at that interview between these two greatest generals, I saw a great deal of General Lee and was present at interviews between him and several of his general officers, but I have never found him on such a footing with any of them as seemed to have been established with General Jackson. I have never seen General Lee unbend as he did then, have never seen him show such implicit confidence and cordiality.

As a rule, General Lee would retreat when abruptly approached, would be careful in his quiet, dignified way to protect himself without being repellent; but, when Jackson would shoot out his suggestions in sharp, short sentences, General Lee listened, weighed them in his own mind, and adopted them. It was not like a conference between general officers; it was more like a consultation between brothers who knew each other and trusted each other.

No wonder General Lee spoke of the loss of his "right arm" in terms of dismay, for he never found any one to replace Jackson. No wonder he could not replace him; for there was not another Jackson, certainly not in the South, probably not in all the world. What effect the fall of Jackson had upon the result of the war is a matter of opinion only, and all speculation is useless. But yet it is permissible to believe that if Jackson had lived there would have been another and a different tale to tell of Gettysburg.

Portrait of a Saint

GAMALIEL BRADFORD, JR.,

Author of "Lee the American"

Francis de Sales was a man who, of his own choice, gave up all the good things of this world out of pure love for the kingdom of God. Born in 1567, the eldest son of a rich and noble French family, with every career of arms or state open to him, he chose the priesthood, and without the use of political influence or intrigue, simply by purity, devotion, and a charming power over souls, became a bishop infinitely beloved, and was duly canonized after his death. Few have better deserved sainthood.

The life of Saint Francis has been obscured by numerous hagiographers with the pious incense of spiritual legend. But one disciple, Camus, Bishop of Belley, has left us a study, *L'Esprit de Saint François de Sales*, which portrays the saint in his daily life almost with the patience and fidelity of a Boswell. Indeed, in some respects, Boswell is outdone; for Camus tells us that when his idol visited him, in order to get more exact material for his record, he bored a hole through into Francis's room, and watched his actions even when he thought himself alone. This is an extreme biographical solicitude to which I do not read that Dr. Johnson was subjected. Perhaps he would not have come out quite so well as Saint Francis is reported to have done.

But far more valuable than such gossip external observation is Saint Francis's own writing, his numerous sermons and treatises, and the intimate personal letters of which a vast number have been preserved.

First, for the shadows, such as they are. It was a bitter time. The battles of the Reformation were fighting everywhere, and both sides were tempted to resort to words and deeds that our cooler—and less believing—age can hardly tolerate. Francis, as bishop in the neighborhood of Protestant Geneva, was drawn into some actions and more words that we are very far from approving. But everything shows that, for his time, he was mild and tolerant, and really cherished the spirit of his own beautiful sentence, written in later life: "He who preaches with love really preaches enough against the heretics, though he does not utter one word of controversy."

In dealing with these practical sides of the divine calling, Sainte-Beuve justly points out that Francis shows the business instincts of a man of the world. He was no recluse, no shy and quiet scholar. He could mingle with men, and influence them, and guide them in every day pursuits. He even complains of the distraction this brought upon him. "The affairs of this diocese are not streams but torrents." When he was sent to Paris for things semi-political, semi-religious, he so demeaned himself that Henri Quatre, that supreme man of the world, spoke of him and treated him with as much affection as respect. If necessary, he could recall high persons to their duty with prophetic sternness, as when he reminded the Duke of Savoy that princes were bound to give great thought to great measures, "on pain of eternal damnation."

It must not be supposed, however, that he was one of the busy, meddling prelates who long to arrange matters of this world as well as of the other. On the contrary, I have sought far for even subtle and indirect evidence of such ambition and have found none. He went into the world for duty. For delight he gladly and often went out of it.

In other words, he was pre-eminently a man of the spirit, a man to whom God meant everything. Not that he was a great theologian. He read widely and the Fathers thoroughly. His own treatise, *De l'Amour de Dieu*, contains much subtle theological discussion, which some may find of profit; but he is always glad to break away from difficult problems and the vain effort to search out the unsearchable. "Poor little insect," he says to his own understanding, "poor little insect, bred from the corruption of my flesh, why will you scorch your wings at this immense fire of divine omnipotence, which would consume and devour the seraphim, if they thrust themselves into such expense of curiosity? No, poor butterfly, thy business is to be lost in adoration, and not to dangle thy plummet in the deep."

This is the mystic's self-abandonment. Saint Francis took to it far more kindly than to the debates of Augustine and Aquinas. The treatise above mentioned is full of mystical ecstasy, drenched with it, and Francis's letters contain many passages even more significant in their high-wrought rapture and their absolute submission to the will of God. "Keeping my soul forever in His di-

vine presence, with a joy not over-impetuous, but, as it seems to me, rich enough to express a perfect love to Him; for nothing in this world is worth our love; it should be all for that Saviour who has given us all of His."

But the essential characteristic of Saint Francis's religion was neither theology nor ecstasy, but sunshine. His heart was simple, and to the simple is given the supreme heritage of joy. He did not, indeed, wholly claim this for himself. "I am, to be sure, by no means simple, but I love simplicity with an extraordinary love." He was simpler than he thought, and pure, and straightforward, and direct.

He was humble, also, did not exalt himself even by the assumption of humility. "Humility, simplicity of heart and of affection, and spiritual submission, are the solid foundations of the religious life." So he wrote, so he thought, and his practice bore out the letter of his teaching.

Above all, in his simplicity and in his humility he had charm. The adjective that occurs most frequently in his writings, that occurs with a singular, penetrating, impressive repetition, is *suave*, which we must free from all its English associations of insincerity and keep only in its primitive significance, of grace, gentleness, sweetness, tenderness. "Let us be saved with our amiable relative, Saint Francis de Sales," writes Madame de Sévigné. "He leads people to Paradise by a pleasanter road than the gentlemen of Port Royal." And one of the great controversialists of the Reformation indicated admirably the same thing: "If it is only a question of convincing, I can do it; but if you want to convert men, take them to the Bishop of Geneva, who has received that gift from God."

The secret of this was, that back of the suavity, giving it breadth and depth and truth, lay the tenderest and kindest humanity. Here was a man at all points tempted as we are, whose own struggles and victories and even more, failures, give him infinite charity for the failures of others. There is never anywhere in Saint Francis tolerance of sin; but there is an inexhaustible tolerance and patience and sympathy for sinners.

And there is further, what one surely does not look for in a canonized saint, but what adds a fine flower to the saint's grace and charm, a rich and joyous gayety which sometimes broadens

into laughter. In the *Introduction to the Devout Life* Saint Francis, though reprehending all uncharitable mockery, permits and encourages light and kindly humor; and he himself does not hesitate to practice his own precept, even in his spiritual letters. "Reverend mother, you should live before God in entire gayety of heart," he writes to Madame de Chantal. And how winning is the gentle irony with which he dissuades an ardent novice from excess of devotion. "My dear daughter, we must allow ourselves repose, enough repose, be kind enough to leave some labor to others, and not try to get all the crowns ourselves: our beloved neighbor will be charmed to have a few."

This suavity, this charity, this large humanity, together with boundless tact and grace in handling souls, made Saint Francis probably one of the most skilful and successful spiritual directors that the Catholic Church has ever known, and it is in this aspect of his activity that the study of him is most interesting and most profitable. As to the value of such direction there has always been dispute and there always will be. Its dangers are obvious. No human soul can wholly take the burden of another. Yet every human soul has moments when it craves all the guidance and comfort that another soul can give it. Few have understood better than Saint Francis how to take advantage of these moments and make the comfort and the guidance lasting.

How far he influenced and governed men I cannot tell. His letters to them, except those of pure business or courtesy, are comparatively few. I cannot help thinking that some rebuff from the sterner sex occasioned one of his very rare expressions of discouragement: "It is wonderful what power the fashions of this world have over mankind, and it seems hopeless to try to remedy this. If you hold up to them hell and damnation, they hide behind the goodness of God. If you press them, they leave you right where you stand." Now and then he writes to some young nobleman, urging upon him the care of his soul. One answers, like Calchas in *La Belle Hélène*, that his natural vocation is to enjoy himself. Ah, says the saint, listen to me and virtue will become a second nature stronger than the first. I wonder if the young man listened. To another, Francis represents the value of the right use of time, and that some portion of the day at least should be given to prayer and meditation; at any

rate, none to reading the fashionable follies of the hour, such as "that infamous Rabelais." And we are reminded of Valentin, the young friend of Goncourt. "Valentin had only two books: a Bible of which he read a little every morning, a Rabelais, of which he read a little every night." With all this, however, it must be remembered that our saint had the infinite respect of men of all classes and characters and that not a few of them came to him in trouble and sorrow and were comforted.

But unquestionably it was women who most often sought help and obtained it. As to his personal relations with them, it is hardly necessary to say that no word of reproach or suspicion is possible. His affection for Madame de Chantal was as pure as it was lofty. Their correspondence, carried on for many years, is one of the most beautiful examples of a spiritual relation mutually elevating, sustaining, and inspiring. With women generally he is said to have urged and to have himself practised the most scrupulous regard for propriety and reserve, making it a rule never to speak to any woman except with a third person present in the room. Also he sets, perhaps half humorously, a rigorous prescription for letters: "When one writes to a woman one ought, if it were possible, to use the point of a penknife, instead of a pen, so as to be sure to say nothing superfluous." Although, as Sainte-Beuve, who quotes this, points out, with his usual charming naiveté he often forgets his own precept and wanders where it takes a swift and current pen to follow him.

In all his counsels to women it is interesting to note not only the high and stimulating impulse to spiritual intensity, but also the delicate restraining hand where spiritual intensity might be carried to excess. No one is more eager than he to urge the religious life upon those who are fit for it, ready for it. To a young girl whose parents are persuading her to marry for the sake of marriage he says: "Those who are naturally inclined to marry and are married happily find so much occasion for patience and for self-denial that they can hardly bear the burden; how should you bear it, when you have entered it against your will?" Yet in other cases he points out that the parent's wish should be thought of first, that domestic duties have their claim, and that a mother's love, although it sometimes seems tormenting, should be considered and respected before everything but the command of God.

Even to small matters of feminine frivolity he brings an affectionate touch of common-sense. It is a pity to dress too daintily but it is better to dress daintily than to worry about dressing daintily. "Tell her to powder her hair, if she likes, so long as her heart is right; for the thing is not worth so much thinking about. Don't get your thoughts entangled among these spider-webs. The hairs of this girl's spirit are more snarled up than those of her head." And although no one knows better than he the depth and power and richness of a woman's soul, there are times when he feels called upon to insist upon her weakness to an extent that would make the new woman somewhat restless. "Your sex needs to be led, and never succeeds in any enterprise but by submission; not that you have not oftentimes as much light as men, but such is the will of God."

It is already sufficiently evident what fine observation, what delicate insight, what acute comparison and distinction were needed to practice the art of soul-direction as Saint Francis practiced it. Everywhere through his writings are scattered reflections and comments as subtle as those of La Rochefoucault or La Bruyère, the profound wisdom of a man who has walked through this cruel and bitter world with eyes well open and not always turned upward. "Everybody finds it easy to practice certain virtues and hard to practice others, and everybody exalts the virtue which he can practice easily and seeks to exaggerate the difficulty of the virtues which are difficult to him." Of the obstinate and stiff-necked he says: "Thus we see that it is a natural thing to be dominated by one's opinions: melancholy persons are ordinarily much more attached to them than those who are of a gay and jovial disposition; for the latter are easily turned by a light finger and ready to believe whatever is told them." And the following shows with what a quick, sharp probe he went right to the bottom of a tormenting spiritual malady as haunting today as three hundred years ago. "Mark these four words that I am going to say to you: your trouble comes from your fearing vice more than you love virtue. If you could give your soul from the very roots to the desire for practical religion, for loving-kindness, and for true humility, you would soon be an acceptable Christian, but you must think of these things all the time."

Mere insight, however, would have carried the saint but little

way in his spiritual labors. Far more important was his sympathy, his power of putting himself in others' places, his infinite love. There is nothing of remote austerity about him, nothing of judicial coldness. He never hesitates to admit his own frailty, his own temptation, his own failures. Has his patient—for what is he but a physician of the soul?—the disease of restlessness? He too has known the evil. "May it not perhaps be a multitude of desires that obstructs your spirit? I myself have been ill of this malady. The bird tied to its perch knows itself to be bound and feels the shock of its detention only when it essays to fly away." Or, as the *Imitation* expresses it, with its inimitable and untranslatable grace, *Cella continuata dulcescit, sed male custodita taedium generat*. And what can be more charming than his confession, after years of ecclesiastical dignity, of the momentary spectre, the intrusive and quickly banished shadow of human regret? "Alas, my daughter, shall I tell you what happened to me the other day? Never in my life before have I had a single hint of temptation against my devout calling. But the other day, when I was least looking for it, such a thing came into my mind, not the wish that I did not belong to the church, that would have been too gross; but because just before, talking with an intimate friend, I had said that if I were still free and were to become heir to a duchy, I should nevertheless choose the ecclesiastical profession, I loved it so much, a little debate arose in my soul, of should I or should I not, which lasted quite a space of time. I could see it, it seemed to me, way, way down in the baser portion of my soul, swelling like a toad. I laughed at it and would not even think whether I was thinking of it. So it went away in smoke and I saw it no more." Would not you and I, who have our own toads crouching in dark corners, if we were to have a confessor at all, wish for a confessor like that?

So, on such a foundation of vast understanding and human sympathy, Saint Francis built up a method of spiritual direction which was all compact of charity and tenderness. For high and low alike he had the same breadth of comprehension, allowed for their failings and appreciated their difficulties. Rare indeed in the seventeenth century is the humanity which would deprive the rich of their pleasures out of consideration for the poor. "It is not reasonable that anybody should take his recreation at the ex-

pense of anyone else, and especially by injuring the poor peasant, who is sufficiently oppressed at all times and whose labor and miserable condition we should always respect." Everywhere in Saint Francis's writings there is the same consideration for weakness and wretchedness, the same desire to make the world better by pity rather than by scorn. Even where scorn is necessary, it should be restrained and moderated. Some things should be treated with contempt, "but the contempt should be subdued and serious, not mocking nor full of disdain."

But let us look more nearly at some aspects of Saint Francis's spiritual labors. To begin with, he was essentially practical, at times almost homely, did not by any means overstress meditation or pure devotion at the expense of everyday virtue. He insists usually upon truth with the strictest emphasis. "I am comforted," he says, in his quaint phraseology, "to find that you have a horror of all finesse and duplicity; for there is no vice more contrary to the *embonpoint* and grace of the soul." It is true, he permits rare and professional exception. "If anybody asks you whether you have told something that you have told under the sacred seal of confession, you may assert boldly, and with no fear of duplicity, that you have not." But, in general, he stands as firm for entire truthfulness as any teacher of any age or country.

On the practice of little virtues he is charming. Not all can be saints, not all can teach or preach, not all can attain that glory which is perhaps as much of a false allurements in the things of virtue as in the things of vice. But there is plenty that all can do. "More than any others, I love these three little virtues, gentleness of heart, poverty of spirit, simplicity of life; also these common deeds of charity, visiting the sick, aiding the poor, comforting the afflicted, and the like. But do these things without feverish anxiety and in the true freedom of the spirit."

It is on this freedom of the spirit that he insists as much as upon anything. Do not fret, do not be anxious, do not be falsely careful. The service of God is a joyous service. Over and over again he repeats these admonitions, which, with Madame de Chantal, were apparently very needful. Now he uses a homely vivacity of phrase, which recalls Montaigne: "Heavens, daughter, I wish the skin of your heart were tougher, that the fleas

might not keep you waking." Now he speaks with a grave tenderness which must have brought comfort to many a weary sinner. "We ought to hate our faults, but with a hatred which should be quiet and tranquil, not spiteful and full of restlessness." Now his joyous fancy sings out in a burst of good cheer, the delicate melody of which is quite untranslatable: *Laissez courir le vent et ne pensez pas que le frifilis des feuilles soit le cliquetis des armes.*

It seems hardly necessary to point out that these practical matters are not all, or even the essential part, of St. Francis's teaching. Through his letters, through his sermons, through his treatises, everywhere runs the passionate insistence upon the joy of spiritual rapture, upon the splendor, the perfection, the all-absorbing ecstasy of communion with God. It does not appear that Saint Theresa herself felt this more fully or proclaimed it more frequently. Only here, as always, Saint Francis shows his serene common sense. Ecstasy is much, he urges, but in our human life on this dusty earth it cannot be all. There are common duties from the performance of which no ecstasy can set us free. "If it pleases God to let us taste of these angelic experiences, we will do our best to receive them worthily; meantime, let us devote ourselves simply and humbly to the little virtues which our Lord has commended to our effort and care."

And as there are times when the sweetest and purest souls cannot rise above themselves, cannot shake off the dust of earth, are overcome and overwhelmed by shadow and despair, or by that dead inertia which is almost worse than despair, for these times especially Saint Francis is ready with consolation, ready with encouragement, ready with hope. Above all, he thinks, souls so cast down should not be chidden or reproved. Let them know, he urges all confessors, let them know that you too are human and have erred and suffered ever as they. "If, for example, you see one who is bowed down by remorse and shame, give him confidence and assurance that you are not an angel any more than he, that you find it in no way wonderful that a mere man should sin." For those hours of wayward depression, which come without cause and vanish without warning, he has his own grace of tender reassurance. Do not strive too much, do not battle too much. Wait and hope and pray patiently for the

goodness of God. And he analyzes such dark phases with a subtlety which shows that he knew well what he was talking about. "The evil sadness comes upon you like a hail storm with an unlooked for change and a vast impetuosity of terror. It comes all at once and you know not whence it comes, for it has no foundation in reason; nay, when it has come, it hunts about everywhere for reasons to justify itself. But the sweet and fruitful sadness comes gently upon the soul, like a soft rain which moistens blessedly, bringing the warmth of consolation; and it comes not unheralded, but for a good and sufficient cause."

The reader cannot but have noticed already that Francis was not only a saint, but a great writer, and as with other great writers, his manner of writing is most significantly characteristic of the man himself. To be sure, he maintains that a preacher should put aside all thought of mere expression and modestly disclaims any literary effort on his own part. "I make no pretense of being a writer; for the sluggishness of my wit and the circumstances of my life—make such a thing impossible for me." Yet it is permitted to doubt, with Saint-Beuve, whether so exquisite a master of words did not take some pleasure in the use of them. Moreover, while denying to the preacher the privilege of literary artifice, Francis enjoins upon him the most careful employment of literary art as an exquisite and powerful means of moving souls. The distinction is sometimes a little hard to draw. But in the following admirable passage he states it clearly: "In a word, you should speak affectionately and devoutly, simply and candidly, and with a firm faith; you should be profoundly possessed by the doctrine you teach and by all that you wish to impress upon others. The greatest artifice of all is to have no artifice . . . You may say what you please, but the heart speaks to the heart, while mere words reach the ears only." Elsewhere he defends the use of figurative expression. "One word should be said about similitudes, they have an incredible efficiency in illuminating the understanding and in touching the will . . . Similitudes from little things, subtly applied, are of extreme utility."

In thus justifying figures of speech, he was justifying himself, as he well knew. For his own style is simple, quaint, tender, at times lofty and solemn; but what distinguishes it most is the extraordinary richness of imaginative suggestion, of similes drawn

from every phase of nature and human life. Flowers, doves, bees, he is never weary of ringing the changes on them. It might be thought, perhaps, that the reader would weary; but he does not. There is such constant freshness of handling, such variety of detail, such an unfailing sense of the spiritual bearing of all these symbols, that you rejoice in each new one blossoming amid doctrinal discussions, as if it were a delicate flower in a barren plain.

And it is to be noted that the charm of these poetical digressions does not come from exact observation. Saint Francis is no Keats, no Thoreau, to spend hours watching the balance of a bird on a wind-tossed spray. Sometimes you get the impression that he has forgotten even prayer in listening to an autumn wind, or has enjoyed a golden morning just for itself, as when he says of doves "their plumage is always smooth and it does you good to see them in the sunshine." But generally his natural world—for that matter, like a good part of Shakespeare's, his exact contemporary—is taken from Pliny, from Virgil, from old books and quaint scholastics, from anything but God's blessed sky and the land and water under it. Phoenixes, unicorns, and salamanders play a large part in his menagerie, and his botany is too often in a class with Falstaff's camomile: "Honors, rank, dignities are like the saffron plant, which the more it is trodden on, the faster it grows."

Yet genius and sincerity can make even wax flowers blossom, and Saint Francis draws from everything profit and help and comfort for the souls whose guidance is, after all, his great and only care. What a light, what a charm, what a winning, winged grace attaches to his words, when he speaks of "marks of the love of God, signs of his good pleasure in our souls. *He nests in the hawthorne of our hearts.*"

What strikes me very much in the life and work of Saint Francis is the immense opportunity for the psychologist. One who has come to consider that nothing is so widely curious, so inexhaustibly fascinating as the study of the human soul, grows almost envious of such a field for purely scientific investigation. When the saint writes, "I have met several souls, which, *closely examined*, offered nothing that I could consider sin," what psychologist in his laboratory can often feel that souls have been *closely examined* in such a sense as that?

But great as the delight of such examination would be, it is easy to see how the saint could find a delight much greater. Indeed, he himself condemns the scientific pleasure of the psychologist as dangerous, if not impious. "Many indulge in rash judgments for the pleasure of philosophizing and divining the characters of people as a mere intellectual exercise. If, by chance, they manage to hit the truth, their audacity and appetite for more increase so much, that it is almost impossible to turn them from the pursuit."

In some of us the appetite and the audacity increase forever. But Saint Francis had interests even more absorbing. With him the object was not to know souls merely, but to help souls, to save souls. The direction of souls to him is "the art of arts." And who will differ from him? Simply to watch, to divine the play of secret springs in the inner life, is exquisite enough. But to use one's cunning sapience to mould souls as if they were wax, to bring light out of darkness, joy out of bitterness, comfort out of great trouble, and a pure and perfect flower out of what seemed a mass of corruption, could any human triumph be greater than this?

Our Taxation Problem

CHARLES LEE RAPER

Professor of Economics and Dean of the Graduate School, University of North Carolina

Many of our citizens are permanently interested—at least they fancy they are—in matters of taxation by the national congress. Their interest in federal taxation has been so continuously important, that the political parties have deemed it the act of political wisdom to proclaim every four years their taxation policies, at least in regard to that form of taxation known as the tariff. Upon the question of internal taxation by the nation—the excise duties on tobaccos, liquors, etc., and the income duties—there has been little widespread interest. Popular interest in taxation by the state and its smaller divisions—the county, the municipality, the school or highway district—has been until very recently as permanently insignificant as that in certain forms of taxation by the nation has been vitally important. What are the reasons? Why, for instance, has the North Carolina citizen been excited, at least in every presidential year, over the tariff—the tax which he pays to the nation? Why has he taken little or no public interest in that which he pays to his own local forms of government?

It is not my purpose in this paper to give the explanation. Whatever the reasons, the fact is, I think, of vital importance. It in large measure explains why we have continued to have in North Carolina, as has been the case in many of our states—in fact, in most of our states—an astonishingly ineffective and unjust system of taxation. Popular interest in taxation by the state of North Carolina and by its local forms of government is, however, rapidly being awakened. This interest became important during the regular session of the legislature from January to March, 1913. The fact of the existence of practically a million dollars deficit in the state treasury and the widespread demand that the state should enable every elementary school to be in effective session for at least six months in every year—these facts, in which the people generally took a vital interest, became potent ones. They gave force to the arguments of those who have for a number of years been systematically interested in remaking our system of the assessment of property for taxation for the purpose of making it more productive of revenue, which the expanding wants of the

state for effective elementary education, highways, public health, etc., have demanded, and more productive of justice among the tax payers. The citizenship of North Carolina came to be interested in taxation as it has rarely been. It would listen to speeches on taxation; the mayors of the towns held conferences devoted to taxation; newspapers would give large space to the facts and discussions of taxation; the report of the state treasurer was widely read: there was much discussion as to the meaning of "pauper counties"—those which receive more from the state in services or money than they pay into the state treasury; the large report of the state corporation commission acting as a state tax commission was talked about; even the constitution of the state as it dealt with revenue and taxation came for the first time in more than a generation to be talked about by others than the student and the constitutional lawyer.

What then is our taxation system, about which there is for the present at least much popular interest? What should it be?

The taxation system of the state is the product of the constitution and the statutes—whatever the constitution allows the legislature to create and whatever the legislature within its constitutional powers actually provides. Some of the defects of the system are due to the constitutional limitation placed upon the power of the legislature to create, and some are clearly due to a failure of the legislature to use the power which it possesses—the failure to provide the machinery for the accurate and just assessment of property for taxation purposes.

An investigation into the constitutional limits which are placed upon the legislative power to levy taxes reveals at once the fact that the poll tax was by our constitution of 1868 and 1876 established as the standard tax for the state and the counties for all their ordinary purposes of government. This standard tax was also limited as to its rate. For ordinary purposes, the total of the poll dues by the state and the county cannot exceed \$2.00. Not only is the rate of the poll tax for ordinary purposes restricted, but that of the property tax is also restricted. The equation that one poll tax by the state and county for ordinary purposes (a maximum of \$2.00) shall always equal the tax levied by the state and county for ordinary purposes on property assessed at \$300, is absolute. For the occasional purpose of defending the

state treasury against a casual deficit or of repelling an invasion, the state may itself exceed the \$2.00 limit, and for special purposes the county may levy practically any rate upon polls its officers may deem necessary.

The fear that our fathers in 1868 had, when by their constitution they made the poll the compulsory standard tax, and when they established for the ordinary purposes of state and county administration an absolute equation between the poll tax and the tax on general property, may have been well grounded. There may have been at that time a real reason for such a system—to protect the native white citizen as a taxpayer from the newly enfranchised blacks and from the newly arrived citizens from the North who were in full sympathy with the negroes as against the native whites. The reason, whatever it may have been in 1868, has absolutely disappeared by this time. There is no longer a vital reason to maintain a compulsory poll tax, especially as the standard of the general property tax. The fact that the proceeds of the state and county poll tax must be exclusively devoted to education and the support of the poor does not make the reason any more cogent. There is no political reason to be found in the fear that the native white will not control the legislature and, through it, the rate of taxation on property, should the constitutional limitation be abolished. There is no economic reason for a compulsory poll tax. Such a tax no longer represents the citizen's ability to pay—the truest principle of taxation—or the benefits derived from the government. The legislature should, therefore, no longer be required to levy such a tax; it might, upon its discretion, continue to do it as a matter of practical expediency. Such a tax is just only when the citizens of a state or locality are, in their ability to pay, equal to each other. Such equality may have existed in the past; it certainly does not exist now among advanced peoples. Because of this fact, the poll tax has practically disappeared except in the states of the United States.

The political and economic reasons for a compulsory poll tax in North Carolina have disappeared. The constitutional limit to the rate of this tax for state and county purposes has been nullified in actual practice. The ordinary and extraordinary purposes of government have been more or less merged by the state, notably by the county; for many years the \$2 limit, as fixed by

the constitution, for state and county purposes has amounted to practically nothing. The range of the poll tax for the state and county combined for 1911 was from \$1.80 in Martin County to \$3.50 in Dare. The municipal poll tax was, of course, extra—from 15 cents in Lawndale to \$4.65 in Asheville. Since the poll duty for state and county purposes in Buncombe was in 1911 \$2, the citizen of Asheville had to pay in this year as poll tax a total of \$6.65. That each tax payer must make this equally large contribution to the government under which he lives, regardless of how small or great his ability to pay, is, I think, a striking though not exceptional illustration of the injustice of the North Carolina poll tax.

The poll tax in North Carolina, while the constitution makes it the standard tax, is not, however, a very important source of revenue; the revenue to the state and counties from this source in 1911 was only \$518,126. The maximum limit which the constitution places upon the rate on general property for the ordinary purposes of state and county is 66 and 2-3 cents on the \$100. This limit, as well as that for the poll tax for ordinary purposes, has come to mean little, since the county has more and more needs that may be classed as extraordinary or as ordinary. Special taxes have frequently been levied upon general property, and not infrequently for purposes that might just as well be grouped as ordinary or extraordinary. The ordinary purposes of government and the special purposes have been by no means clearly differentiated. The limit as set by the constitution of North Carolina to protect the tax payer has in many cases been regularly set aside or overleaped. The range of the tax on general property for the state and county was in 1911 as low as 60 cents on the \$100 in Martin County and as high as \$1.43 in Mitchell. The municipal tax on general property is, of course, an extra levy, and the range of its rate is large. In 1911 the lowest was 8 cents in Hassell, the highest \$1.75 in Canton. The rate for state and county purposes combined in Haywood County, in which Canton is situated, was in 1911 \$1.10—making a total for the citizen of Canton of \$2.85 on the \$100.

The constitutional limit to the rate on general property should, therefore, be abolished. The citizens by a simple majority vote may now exceed it whenever they wish to do so for special pur-

poses of government. To make the school and the highways, for which most of the special taxes are levied, more effective is not in the real logic of government a special function. It is today more permanently important than to provide an army for defense; it is as vitally important and permanent as the maintenance of efficient and permanent courts of justice. Many of our states have no constitutional limit to the rate on general property. The citizen is willing to leave the rate to the discretion of his legislator, who, for the sake of re-election to the general assembly, or for the sake of some other public office, if not indeed for the sake of low taxes upon his own property, is sufficiently eager to work for as low a rate as is practicable. If such states as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Kansas, need no constitutional limitation, why should North Carolina?

Our poll tax is collected with comparative efficiency and justice; not many of our citizens are able to escape the assessment of their poll. The general property tax is, on the other hand, notably ineffective and unjust. There are a number of reasons for this, among which are, I think, the constitutional requirement of a uniform rate on all forms of general property and the fact that the legislature has failed to provide effective state and county machinery for assessment.

The constitution of North Carolina says that "laws shall be passed taxing, by uniform rule, all moneys, credits, investments in bonds, stocks, joint stock companies, or otherwise; and also all real and personal property, according to its true value in money." This means that the state and each local community—county, township or town—must tax all general property by the same rate, regardless of the nature of the property. It does not, of course, prevent one of the local communities from levying one rate and another local community another rate. This rigid constitutional requirement of a uniform *ad valorem* rate explains in part the remarkable ineffectiveness and injustice in our system of taxing general property. This provision, I think, should be abolished, and the legislature should have the right to make a reasonable classification of general property for purposes of taxation. To tax all kinds of property at a uniform rate is most assuredly unfair unless the values of all its forms are with equal accuracy put upon the assessor's books. And it may reasonably be doubted

whether such a rate is fair when the assessment is made with practical perfection. Is it not true that kinds of property differ in their values and in their relationships to the community in which they are situated and to the government to which they owe their contribution? Whether this difference is sufficiently real and vital as to necessitate a differentiation as to the rate levied or not, no one can doubt the difference in property as to its tangibility to the assessor. All agree that some forms of property are more easily put upon the assessor's books and that other forms are put upon these books with much uncertainty and difficulty. The uniform *ad valorem* rate falls, without doubt, more heavily upon the taxpayer whose mind and conscience are more tangible and upon the more tangible forms of property. The citizen whose property is less tangible, as a rule, does damage to his conscience and to his duty to his community; our present machinery is so notably ineffective that it practically leaves the assessment of his property to his elastic conscience. Moneys, credits, etc., if assessed at all, must, of course, be put upon the assessment books at par value. They are self-assessing whenever the mind and heart of the citizen are pure and unselfishly patriotic to his community and charitable to his fellow taxpayer. In actual practice very little of moneys and credits is led by the citizen's community spirit and individual conscience to the altar of the tax assessor's books. To be sure, the moneys, credits, etc., which trustees hold for widows, orphans, and minors are most generally put upon the assessor's books at par value. The values of land, houses, and many other forms of general property, are at best only estimates; and these estimates vary within a remarkably wide range. I know of one piece of real estate situated in a North Carolina town which is on the assessor's books at \$250 when its market value is at least \$15,000, while nearby it is another piece of property assessed at \$3,500 when its market value is about \$5,500.

The reason for the constitutional requirement of a uniform *ad valorem* rate on all kinds of general property came from the assumptions, that all kinds of property were equally vital to the community and the citizen in proportion to their value, and that the exact value of each kind could and would be placed upon the assessor's books. This provision was incorporated into the con-

stitution at a time when property was much more largely uniform than it has become in recent years. Property is coming to be lacking in uniformity as to value and condition of production, consumption, and distribution. The experience of the world is clear enough to disprove largely the first assumption and entirely the second. The lesson of this experience has been sufficient to cause the abandonment, in order to secure greater justice and efficiency in taxation, of a uniform *ad valorem* rate by practically all the European countries except Switzerland and Holland. England took the lead more than one hundred years ago. More than a dozen of our states have abandoned the uniform *ad valorem* principle, among which are Pennsylvania and Maryland. Even North Carolina has for years believed in a differentiated rate for taxes on license or privilege; the constitution of 1876 allowed the legislature to tax one trade at one rate, another trade at a different rate. And the experiences with a reasonable classification of general property have, I think, proved the soundness, the wisdom, and the practical efficiency of the differentiated rate, when carefully and effectively applied. The example of Baltimore city might be considered. Prior to 1897 Baltimore had the uniform *ad valorem* system. In 1896 she had on her assessor's books only \$6,000,000 of intangible personalty (securities), at a rate of \$2 on the \$100. In 1897 a rate for this class was fixed at 30 cents on the \$100 and she placed upon her books \$58,700,000; in 1907 the figure reached \$150,900,000. The \$2 rate in 1896 secured only \$120,000 in revenue; the 30 cents rate in 1907 produced revenue to the amount of \$452,700—a large increase in revenue and in justice to the taxpayer.

Perhaps the most popular proposition on tax reform now before us in North Carolina is that to segregate the sources of revenue for the different units of government—that the state should take to itself those sources which are more nearly state-wide (tax on corporations, inheritance, income, franchise, and license) and leave to the local communities—the county, town, etc.—those sources which are more essentially local in their nature. The constitution now forbids such segregation. Shall this clause be eliminated? Shall the constitution be so amended as to allow the legislature to make a reasonable segregation of the sources of revenue? It is said in support of the proposition that the consti-

tutions of seven of our states permit such action by the legislature and that four of these states have put into practice such a plan with distinct success—Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. These states have, to be sure, made such an experiment, but they have not all of them wholly abandoned a general property tax for state revenue. New York, for instance, resorts to the general property tax for state purposes occasionally—in times of need. The fact should, however, be most clearly held in mind that these four states are industrial rather than agricultural, and that such a state as New York or New Jersey may effectively have segregation of sources, while North Carolina may not at all be prepared for it. New York in 1909 obtained, out of a total revenue of \$29,283,182, 32 per cent. of her revenue from a corporation tax, and did it without harm to the corporations, and 24 per cent. from inheritance dues; she procured as much as \$12,153,188 from an inheritance tax in 1912. New Jersey in the same year—1909—easily obtained 92 per cent. of her state revenue from corporation taxes, and 8 per cent. from inheritances.

The question of the separation of sources of revenue for the state and its local units of administration is, however, a difficult one, and it should be thought out in every possible bearing before North Carolina should adopt such a plan. In North Carolina, in fact in the large majority of our states, the state government rather than that of the county or municipality is the vital unit, and must be from the very nature of its task. The problem of segregation must, therefore, be solved for any state in connection with this fundamental fact and in connection with the fact of the actual economic conditions prevailing at the time in the state. The state treasury of North Carolina must, I think, render for many years important aid in the development of the elementary schools in the rural sections—the greater portion of the commonwealth. This does not suggest that the localities shall not themselves perform as much of the educational service as is practicable; they should be compelled to do as much as possible. It means that many of these localities will remain for some years at least too poor in economic resource to support as effective educational service as they demand for the sake of their own growth and for the sake of their relationship to other localities

in the state and to the state as a vital whole. The state treasury, for the same reason, must also render important aid to the weaker localities in highway building. The state treasury of North Carolina must, therefore, for many years to come have large resources of revenue. It must bear the expenditures necessary for the state-wide services—administration, legislation, the application of justice, the support of the higher educational institutions and the maintenance in a state of efficiency of the necessary penal and charitable institutions. It must also help to bear the expenditures necessary for effective elementary schools and highways in all parts of the state. These needs of the state treasury, which should be supplied with funds from practically all portions of the state, will long be imperative.

The corporation, franchise, and inheritance taxes may be sufficient for the state's needs in such industrial sections as Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware. Are they in North Carolina? The legislature early in 1913 took an important step toward a larger contribution from the state treasury to elementary education. It set aside, in addition to the 20 cents on the \$100 already levied by it for elementary schools, 5 cents of the state levy (23 and $\frac{2}{3}$ cents on the \$100) as a state equalizing school fund, for the purpose of making, with local aid, the term in every district in the state six months or as nearly six months as possible. This means the need of a larger fund in the state treasury. Can this effectively and justly come from corporation, inheritance, and franchise taxes? I think not; at least for the present. In 1911 the state treasury received for state purposes, out of a total from all sources of \$3,002,085, \$252,135 from taxes on railways and other public service corporations, \$19,187 from corporation excess (excess of the value of the corporation stock over the assessed value of the real and personal property belonging to the corporation), \$37,932 from the income tax, \$9,822 from the inheritance dues, \$86,542 from corporation franchises, etc., \$111,787 from general license and privilege taxes, \$5,702 from express companies' receipts, \$250,230 from insurance companies, \$25,326 from railway privilege tax, \$2,908 from telegraph companies, \$14,976 from telephone companies; and from the general property taxes, \$1,555,499 (\$1,243,052 came from real and personal property). Can the state treasury obtain from the

state-wide sources a sum sufficient to offset the \$1,555,499, the most of which would go to the local treasuries, should the state adopt segregation of the sources of revenue?

Is it practicable for the state to give to the local governments the funds derived from the taxes on real and personal property—\$1,243,052 as obtained in 1911—and to procure this amount from increased taxes on corporations, inheritances, incomes, franchises, or licenses? To place a much heavier burden upon corporations or their franchises than is now done would discourage industrial growth. The revenue from inheritances could easily be increased over the present insignificant amount by effective machinery, but it cannot for many years become very much. North Carolina has few rich citizens and no very rich ones. The revenue from the income tax could be increased to an important degree when the machinery of assessment is made effective and when the constitution is amended so as to permit a general income tax; the present constitution does not allow the income derived from property which is taxed under the general property tax to be taxed. But when all these increases have been made, the state treasury will not have sufficient funds, for a time at least, should it give up all revenue from real and personal property taxes to the local units of administration.

Segregation of the sources of revenue is not, I think, now practicable. It may, however, become so in the comparatively near future. I am, therefore, willing that the constitution be amended so as to permit such segregation whenever the economic conditions become such as to make it feasible. The constitution should not, I think, be amended frequently; the fundamental rules of our law should be changed seldom. And the section of the constitution which deals with taxation should be, when amended, as brief as possible. It should contain only a few fundamental principles. Our experience, as well as that of many of the other states, if not indeed all the other states, has proved that the constitution is inelastic—that it is difficult to amend it to meet the changing economic conditions of the people. It has also proved that the legislature must be elastic in its power of taxation because of these changing conditions. We should go back to the old idea of a brief constitution, one that places the fewest fundamental principles and limitations upon the legislature in its power of taxa-

tion. The tendency toward more and more details in the constitutions, which has become stronger and stronger since the middle of the last century, has placed so many restrictions upon the legislature's power to tax as to make its task very difficult. If the citizens of England are sufficiently protected against excessive taxation by parliament when their constitution contains no statement about the kind of a tax or its rate, if the citizens of Germany and of our own federal nation demand no constitutional restriction upon the power of the legislature to levy taxes, why should the constitution of North Carolina contain numerous and detailed limitations?

But when the constitution has been amended so as to allow the legislature to classify property and to separate the sources of state and local revenue, and to have sufficiently large powers over the assessment of property values and over the levy of rates, we shall still be in the wilderness of confusion, ineffectiveness, and injustice in our taxation, unless the legislature makes provision for effective machinery of assessment. A special class of moneys, credits, etc., may then be made by the legislature, but inefficiency and injustice will continue unless the legislature creates effective machinery for assessing the various kinds of taxables. The separation of sources of state and local revenue may then be provided, but one locality will continue, as now, to assess its property at a higher percentage of its market value, another locality at a lower, and some property will continue to remain unlisted upon the assessor's books unless the state and the locality have the most effective system of assessment possible. A large amount of the present ineffectiveness and injustice in taxation is due to the lack of machinery, which the legislature has all the time had the power to provide. One citizen has borne heavy burdens for another, and likewise one township or county, or one form of property, for the gain of another. The constitution of North Carolina has not debarred the legislature from providing a fairly effective remedy, as is clearly proved by the experience of Wisconsin, Kansas, and West Virginia, which are not allowed by their constitutions to classify property for taxation or to segregate the sources of revenue for the different units of administration. These states have done much toward an effective and just system of taxation by providing effective state-wide and local machinery of assessment; this fact is remarkably clear.

The thing we need in North Carolina, along with an amendment to our constitution, is a thorough-going revision of our machinery of assessment. The corporation commission has since 1901 served as a state tax commission and for a time also as a state bank commission. Its work as a corporation commission has, I think, been comparatively successful, and also as a bank commission; and this is all one can reasonably ask of it. Its tasks as a state tax commission have not been performed with any important success. The fact is clear that under it many kinds of inefficiency and injustice have continued from year to year. There has been practically no county equalization of assessment and no equalization between the counties—the specific duty of the state corporation commission acting as a state board of equalization. The state corporation commission has had for the most part no control over the actual list-taking and assessing. The county commissioners have most of the time controlled this work; they have appointed, oftentimes without care in selection, the assessor for the township; they have offered him the insignificant pay of from \$2.00 to \$3.00 a day for only a few days in each year.

Effective and equitable assessment with such machinery is, of course, an impossibility. To assess property accurately—and no assessment is fair unless it is made accurately—requires officers of expert ability, and such officers cannot be had for such a small reward. We have been willing to pay the sheriff of the county, much of whose work is to collect taxes,—an act which requires little judgment, since he has the power to force collection,—a fair wage. We have offered the assessor, whose task should always demand excellent judgment, a wage which would soon lead him for support to a charitable institution, had he not another occupation.

We have need of much more revenue for the state and many of its local units. This need could be supplied with fair success had we sufficient machinery of assessment. We need more justice in taxation, and an effective machinery of assessment could in large part secure satisfaction of this want. We need more farmers in North Carolina; an effective and just assessment of agricultural land for taxation would put more of it upon the market or into efficient cultivation. We need in many of our towns more build

ings; an effective system of taxation would put more of our idle lands upon the building market or cause the present owners to build upon them.

What is an effective system of assessment? The experiences of a number of states—notably Kansas, Wisconsin, West Virginia, the only example of effective assessment in the South,—have proved that North Carolina must have a system substantially as follows, before she can ever expect efficiency and justice in her taxation:

(1) A state tax commission, with large powers of supervision over all assessment and over all the local officers of assessment, can, I think, alone meet the requirements of the state-wide machinery. The term of its office should be from six to eight years. Its members should be appointed by the governor, not elected. Efficiency and justice, not politics, should be the aim of all assessors. They should be experts and as non-partisan as possible. Their salaries should be large enough to attract men who have brains, character, and courage, and who could afford to devote all their time and energies to their official duties. Wherever such a body has worked, taxation has become more effective and equitable; more revenue has come to the state, the rate of taxation has frequently declined, and the burden of taxation has been more justly placed upon the citizens.

(2) A permanent county office of assessment. This office should be under the direction and supervision of the state tax commission, and its members should be selected by this commission, at least with its sanction. This local office should assess all the taxables in its territory except those of state-wide significance, which should be assessed by the state tax commission. The salary of the chief official in the local office should be large enough to command the undivided service of a man of ability and courage. Wherever the local assessment office has been permanent, efficient, and under vital supervision by a state tax commission, it has resulted in a larger revenue to the state and more justice to the taxpayer.

Is it not the ideal of true citizenship to strive constantly for more efficiency and justice in everything that the individual or the state shall attempt to do?

The Hobbies of an Educated Man*

WILLIAM WISTAR COMFORT

Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures in Cornell University

Among the false aphorisms which will not be put down is this: all men are equal. There is a grain of truth in the remark. It is true that we all come into the world in the same way. In the race of life, we are even at the start; but we are never abreast again until, by a great mystery, we are all neck and neck as we cross the tape. In the interval of inevitable inequality, which covers the whole period of life, what is to distinguish educated people? What is to be hall-mark of liberal education? What fruit have we to show when we are examined for the results of our college years? Surely, not mere knowledge of the Past, not mere aptitude in reasoning from cause to effect, least of all mere technical and manual skill. Each of these accomplishments may be gained otherwise, more speedily and less dearly, in the school of life. One need not go to college to acquire the technical essentials for making money. A wide-awake farmer, a foreman of a construction gang, a clerk, a reporter, a corner-grocery politician, may all succeed in their respective niches without having exposed themselves to a college course. A faithful, painstaking young woman may without a college education make a good secretary, stenographer, and, if she be strong enough, a good nurse or a militant suffragette.

How then are they who spend four years and perhaps a couple of thousand dollars in the formal pursuit of education to claim that they are in any way more favored than other men and women who are busy earning their daily bread and increasing the nation's wealth? It is a direct challenge. Without being a utilitarian, I insist that we must give a reason for the faith that is in us. What is the use of our endeavor to secure an education? It is because so many young people can give no cogent reason for seeking an education that their education so often fails of any purpose. They don't know what they are seeking; so they find nothing. One very vital purpose of an education I propose to consider. And in order to vary the language in which the subject is

*In substance an address delivered at Gullford College, North Carolina, on May 27, 1913.

sometimes set forth, and thus to bring the discussion on to familiar ground, I shall claim that one object of an education is to provide us with a by-product—a hobby.

I think I recall correctly having heard Professor J. P. Mahaffy, the Irish classical scholar, maintain that in this country the tendency of our higher education was to train men to make a living: whether in engineering, law, pedagogy, or medicine, it makes no difference; the object is to give some assets which can be turned definitely into dollars and cents. At Oxford and Cambridge, on the contrary, he maintained, the tendency had always been to educate a man so that he would be able to employ himself profitably and agreeably when he was not working for his living. If we make Professor Mahaffy's observation in another form, we may say that the effect of American education is to teach a man to be resourceful and independent; whereas the English universities provide a man with the means to find recreation in intellectual pursuits. I think there is wisdom in the English theory of university education, if we use it to temper our own national practice; and it is precisely of the value to the individual of a combination of these two theories that I wish to speak.

It is important to insist upon the development of what we have called a hobby as an essential aim of our educational methods. So long as we train men and women merely to earn a living by manual or intellectual skill, we are performing a useful service for them personally. But we are missing the larger conception of education in relation to society, precisely because the disinterested motive, the unselfish considerations which lead to service, are lacking. It is a great misfortune for any college graduate to feel that he has gained no profit from his course except that of increase in his earning capacity, and that his ideal of life remains purely utilitarian and mercenary. "Perpetual devotion to what a man calls his business," says Robert Louis Stevenson, "is only to be sustained by perpetual neglect of many other things. And it is not by any means certain that a man's business is the most important thing he has to do."

In the domain of education it is quite proper that a student should follow intently some one subject through a great part of his college course—follow what the Germans call a *Hauptfach*; but, to prevent short-sightedness and loss of mental perspective,

it is equally important that he should consider some other field of knowledge, and this the Germans call a *Nebenfach*. In all our graduate schools we insist that even an advanced student shall busy himself with one or two minor subjects beside the major subject in which he hopes to make a contribution to human knowledge. The purpose of this insistence upon the minor subjects is to guarantee breadth of view, a sense of proportion, a sane critical judgment. The oculist tells us students whose time is largely spent over books, that, if we would preserve our keen vision, we must go frequently out into the open air, accustom our eyes to the sight of distant objects and horizons, and thus rest them after the close application to our studies. And so, when a student of literature seeks my advice, I commend to his attention the allied fields of philosophy, art, and history, in order that he may not become narrow in his interests or prejudiced in his judgments. For the undergraduate as for the graduate student the minor subjects serve as a balance-wheel, and this balance-wheel is indispensable for the well-rounded scholar, as it is, I hope to show, for the effective life of service to which we are called.

For the little academic world in which many of us have lived is not an end in itself; it is but a sort of antechamber from which the Senior passes into a vast hall of strife and opportunity. Happy he who can maintain his place in the jostling throng and feel that he is paying his own way! But that is not enough. That is mere existence. Those who have had the privileges of a higher education have a right to expect something more than existence. The spirit of such favored mortals must dominate their existence and not be the mere tool of physical demands. As someone has said, our business is not to make a living, but to live a life. And life means the joy of liberty and resourcefulness, the response to the call of God's world, the stimulus of accomplishment. There is an immeasurable cleft between the existence of the rock and the joyous life of the bluebell or the daisy, the swallow and the thrush. And still wider is the cleft which divides man, created in his Maker's own image, from all the rest of creation. He alone has received the greatest of gifts—reason, free will, liberty—inestimable privileges carrying with them vast responsibilities.

It is not now my purpose to speak of the importance of a personal spiritual experience as the deepest well-spring of a satisfactory life. To have fought the good fight, to have finished the course with credit, to be conscious of a crown of life laid up for us as for St. Paul, must be in the minds of all the ultimate measure of success. The mightiest power in the world is the human spirit engaged in its high calling of collaboration with the Divine. All the greatest successes in human history have been gained in the domain of the spirit. Such triumphs are simply on a different plane. They admit of no comparison with the petty victories of the body and the mind.

Having made a place for faith in spiritual values as the chiefest factor in success, as even men rate success, let us turn to what I called our hobbies as a source of human joy, repose, balance, and efficiency. A hobby is a *Nebenfach*. It is a by-product, a side-issue, *not* the main business of life. As the tired business man may love to mount his horse of flesh and blood for a canter through the woods and fields of a summer evening, so a much larger class of jaded human beings love to mount their hobby-horse and ride at their own sweet will through the unexplored fields of intellectual delight. We love our hobbies because they are of our own choice. No man has foisted them upon us, as he may have imposed the law or a business career. Our hobbies are of our own begetting, and we love them as our own offspring. They represent our inmost selves; we lavish upon them our most unselfish efforts; we guard them from the observation of a cold and unsympathetic world; from them we draw strength and inspiration to continue the struggle of life. They are the truest indication of personality. Tell me what a man's hobby is, and I have the best criterion of his character and tastes. Show me a man in his leisure hours, and I can estimate the depth of his inner life better than can be done when he is in court, in the stock-exchange, or the class-room. A worthy hobby is a sure sign of an advanced intelligence in its possessor.

Our hobbies then are essentially personal. They may be the very breath of our nostrils, the very joy of our life. They are in any case invaluable as offering repose, recreation, enthusiasm. Before considering some of the mental and physical occupations which we call by this frivolous name, let me point out one feature

of a hobby which is invariable: a hobby has nothing to do with the so-called practical conduct of life; a man does not make his living by it; there is no money in it. Upon some hobbies it is possible to spend money; but strictly speaking, if you try to make money out of your hobby, you are taking from it its very life and charm; you are besmirching its character. A hobby stands for the individual's refusal to sell *all* of himself for lucre. It represents the one little sacred enclosure of individuality in defense of which the owner is prepared to defy the entire world with its battering-rams of criticism, convention, and mockery. The benefits to be derived from a hobby are altogether subjective in the first instance. Selfish, then, if you will; but selfish in the best sense. For the hobby restores the man to himself, renews his threatened personality every morning, restores his vitality every evening, prepares him daily for that rough and tumble fight in the world to maintain his place and to secure the triumph of his ideals.

Let us see to what occupations an educated man may profitably devote his leisure hours in order to restore his personality. Just as the normal child with passionate intensity collects, labels, and pores over his stamps, birds' eggs, or Indian arrow-heads, so we older children should have some more or less intrinsically futile object upon which to expend our thought and in which we may find recreation. I would not set much store by the boy who did not collect anything, who did not have some holy of holies in which he hived away his pathetic little treasures of sticks and stones and colored glass. See how instinctive is this search for privacy, this secret meditation upon the things most precious to the little boy! Later, with school, comes the age for all the bawbles and knickknacks which boys and girls trade in and discuss when they are left to be really themselves at recess and after the humdrum school is over. Still later, youth takes on other very individual interests: the garden with its vegetables and flowers, some poultry, a turning-lathe, fancy work, music, arts and crafts, offer a field for the development of those precious individual traits which make us what we are and keep us from sinking to the level of human machines.

There is a close analogy between school and life. Most of life, like most of our school years, is spent in accomplishing some

more or less hard task. To overcome resistance by application and endeavor is good for the soul. In school, however, as in life, there is of necessity a place to be reserved for more congenial studies. Hence the popular elective system, adopted freely in our entire educational programme. All work and no play, even in the intellectual domain, makes us dull indeed. Those who have already finished their specific preparation for life, who today face the unfolding of their unconstrained personality, will, I hope, appreciate the truth of what has just been said. If so, how can life be planned so as to incorporate in its programme a place for those hobbies which, I claim, are the logical continuation of the elective studies of college days?

The hobbies upon which a man may indulge his taste are legion. If one is an amateur collector on a large scale, it may be necessary to spend some money. The King of England is said to have one of the most complete collections of postage stamps in existence; the King of Italy is reputed an international authority on coins; the greatest financier of our own country seems to have collected almost everything, from masterpieces of art to railroads in the receiver's hands, from Italian madonnas to the Southern Railway. And all this, mark you, for the human joy of doing something you don't have to do, for the lust of indulging individual tastes. For the joy of collecting is the same whether you collect diamonds or marbles. But after the great ones of the earth comes the average man: he may grow flowers, run a stock-farm, play the flute, travel, read books, take photographs, ride horseback, run an automobile, paint pictures, or write poetry; he may collect anything under the canopy of heaven. It makes no difference what he does, if it does him or others no harm, and if it daily refreshes his soul with interest and enthusiasm. Professor Child of Harvard, the English scholar, tenderly cherished his rosebushes; Horace Walpole's letters are full of references to his search for works of art for Strawberry Hill; Petrarch was always on the lookout for classical manuscripts; Socrates had his weather-eye open for sophists to annihilate; Descartes, like Cervantes, was a soldier, but each has left behind him something more precious to humanity than victory in battle; Saint Paul was by trade a Cilician tent-maker, by avocation he became the bearer of a new message to the Gentile world. It appears that posterity is quite

as ready to honor men for distinction in the pursuit of a hobby as for distinction in their conduct of business.

To confine our attention for a moment to letters, we may observe that all ancient and much of our modern literature is a by-product. Professional authorship is a very modern development. Even now, despite the advertisements, authorship does not suffice to pay the grocery bills of very many men and women. But how many men are famous for their by-products? Molière was an actor and manager, but yet he found time to write the greatest comedies of modern times; Cervantes, after fighting at Lepanto and living a prisoner in Algiers, wrote *Don Quixote* and died in comparative poverty; Benvenuto Cellini was a famous goldsmith at the Papal court, but he left behind him the most highly rated autobiography in existence; Madame de Sévigné was a busy society woman in the days of Louis the Fourteenth, but she found time to write ten volumes of the most fascinating personal letters one can read; Anthony Trollope was a postoffice employee when he wrote the Barchester and Parliamentary novels; and Nathaniel Hawthorne was a Salem custom-house officer when he was preparing *The Scarlet Letter*. The list could be indefinitely prolonged, especially in European literature. Surely there is abundant reason for any one who may feel the impulse to put pen to paper in prose or rhyme, to seek diversion, if not fame, in that way. Of all hobbies upon which one may spend one's time, the buying, reading, and writing of books is perhaps the most engrossing and the most thoroughly satisfying.

Thus far we have been considering the possession and, so to speak, the practice of a hobby as an invaluable asset in increasing the joy and efficiency of life. It may have been felt, as already hinted, that the cultivation of a hobby is a rather selfish diversion. Lest the thought which has run through these remarks should be interpreted too narrowly, let us now shift our fundamental conception of a hobby as an asset in an *individual* life, and see if we may not carry it over into some of the duties and privileges of association with others in the cause of righteousness. Starting with the admitted necessity of earning a living as the business which lies nearest to the hand of each of us, how can we make effective our leisure hours? I have already referred to some of the interests which grip individuals and enable them to

maintain and develop their personal tastes. But there are other affairs, perhaps more noble and more disinterested, into which educated men with their trained minds and high ideals are rightly expected to throw themselves. There are a score of causes in which a man may unselfishly enlist his intelligent service: the improvement of social, political, agricultural, and religious conditions, which forms the programme of countless organizations existing outside the sphere of actual government and politics. For service in these organizations there is usually no pay. They may claim only our leisure hours. Yet their very existence and the attainment of the goal for which they are striving depend upon those of us who are convinced that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of what he may eat and drink. Food and drink are our living, as they are of the beast, but they are not our life.

So the teacher at his desk, the merchant in his office, the broker on 'change, the worker in the shop and the mill, the laborer on the farm—are all called to have some interest which shall raise them above mere existence, are all summoned in our democracy to associate themselves with the countless unselfish endeavors to make justice, love, and honor prevail. This call, to be sure, is not yet heard by all. Examples of the self-centered existence are everywhere about us. That man is truly educated, whether he may have been to college or not, who is trained efficiently to provide for those who are dependent upon him, and who brings to bear upon the problems of his time a personality fresh and free.

And thus, you see, while still adhering to the essential idea of a hobby, we have got upon a higher platform, we have risen into a higher stratum of duty and privilege. The *sine qua non* for the amateur collector as for the amateur reformer in an infinite capacity for enthusiasm in an unremunerative ideal. We necessarily give of ourselves daily in exchange for our physical needs; let us learn to give of ourselves daily in the attainment of some disinterested purpose. In the latter, rather than in the former process, are we likely to find happiness and to win the esteem of our fellows.

Let us return before closing to the pertinent question: what reason can we give for desiring an education? I hope I may have suggested one important mark by which an educated man may be distinguished. In addition to being merely trained in mind or

body so that he may be to some extent master of his fate, he should be distinguished by his generous outlook upon life. He must be more than one-sided; he must have some concern beside that of making a living; he must see Utopias possible of attainment toward which he yearns to lead the people. The possession of this unselfish conception of life and its duties is not peculiar to the so-called educated class. Many people possess it in the highest degree, who can boast of no college education, but who have absorbed elsewhere the spirit of generous service. The ideals of truth, honor, justice, and love should, however, be especially cherished and expounded by the scholars. If the scholars fail, by whom then shall virtue be extolled? So that if you are to give a reason for the faith in the value of an education, if you are to claim any pre-eminence therefor, let it be with a humbling sense of responsibility for the realization of the visions you have seen, the eternal ideals of which you have caught a glimpse.

We are ready now to take our last step, to make our last observation on this topic. Just as we saw it was a healthy and normal thing for the child, the youth, and the mature man, each in his time, to have some side-interest, some *Nebenfach*, in which to let his individuality find play, so now I may say: See to it that your hobby is a worthy one to occupy a trained human mind. The trivial diversion which sufficed for the child must, in the case of the scholar, be swept aside to make room for great unselfish issues. In the long run scholars have directed the progress of human thought, and, if you belong to the scholar clan, you must strive with it on the field for truth, honor, justice, and righteousness.

My plea is in reality for the open-minded citizen, not totally engrossed in material affairs. We need him everywhere, in the cities, the towns, and in the rural sections of the country. He need not be highly educated; but he must possess that generous, wise, and open mind which is attracted instinctively to the worthy cause, and which should be surely the possession of our trained scholars. There can be no law to compel this attitude of mind. We may refuse to participate. But remember it is what we do not have to do that counts. One is likely to attain greater honor, live more happily, and reflect more credit upon his forebears and his teachers, if he goes through life sometimes doing what he might justify himself for leaving undone.

No bread tastes so sweet as bread that has been cast upon the waters and found later after many days. The savoring of this experience ought to be that of the educated man. He can afford to wait for it. For, as the little boy comes to learn that his life is a mysterious combination of hard school tasks and hours of happy pursuit of bird and flower, so you have learned in your college years that the hard, bare facts of existence are not all of life. Truth and the pursuit of truth shall set you free—free to cultivate your own personality, and free to spend your leisure hours to the glory of God and the deliverance of Man.

State, Nation, and the "New Freedom"

LLOYD T. EVERETT, Esq.

The assertion is often made in these days of reform rampant and pervasive "progressivism" that the constitution of the United States was fathered by a lot of fine old reactionaries. Consult the record, and it will be found that, as the term *reactionary* is now understood, the charge has much to stand on. Take an incident from the convention of Virginia, 1788, which, after searching investigation and long and strenuous debate, ratified or acceded to the instrument by the close vote of 89 to 79. Early in these Virginian debates we hear this from Mr. Nicholas, a supporter of ratification, in answering objections to the powers of taxation granted to the new general government:* "So far as the amount of the imposts may exceed that of the present collections, so will the burdens of the people be less." (Now, hearken to the reason advanced in support of this claim): "Money cannot be raised in a more *judicious manner* than by imposts; *it is not felt by the people*; it is a mode which is practiced by many nations; nine-tenths of the revenues of Great Britain and France are raised by indirect taxes; and were they raised by direct taxes, they would be exceedingly oppressive. At present, the reverse of the proposition holds in this country; for very little is raised by indirect taxes."

In his day and generation, and for the purpose immediately in view, Mr. Nicholas was wise. The old "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union" between the thirteen revolted British-American republics had not worked to the filling of the common treasury. Under Article VIII of this older "federal constitution," as the Articles of Confederation were then commonly termed, it was provided that the federal (or, "Continental") revenues were to be raised by the several states "in proportion to the value of all land within each state," etc., by means of taxes laid and levied by the respective state legislatures "within the time agreed upon by the united states in congress assembled." It was complained that the states had become very dilatory in meeting these requisitions from the central body; hence, the then existing poverty of the national treasury, so that the Congress was forced to bor-

*Elliot's *Debates*, III, 99.

row from abroad the very money needed to pay the interest due on prior debts to European creditors.*

In this deplorable condition of national affairs even Jefferson, staunch home ruler and states' rights man that he was, found himself moved to declare, vehemently:† "There never will be money in the treasury till the confederacy shows its teeth. The States must see the rod; perhaps it must be felt by some one of them." Jefferson at that time (1786), as minister of the United States to France, had official relations with our European creditors and felt keenly the humiliation of our beggarly financial condition. Even so, Jefferson was for using this "rod" as sparingly as possible. He said, in the letter just quoted from: "Every rational citizen must wish to see an effective instrument of coercion, and should fear to see it on any other element than the water. A naval force can never endanger our liberties, nor occasion bloodshed: a land force would do both."

This proposed recourse of coercing a confederate state in the matter of taxes was discussed in the constitutional convention of 1787. The project was discarded in favor of conferring upon Congress the power to collect taxes from the individual taxpayer, instead of by requisitions upon the several states as formerly. Madison, one of the delegates opposing state coercion, declared:‡ "A union of States containing such an ingredient seemed to provide for its own destruction. The use of force against a State would look more like a declaration of war than an infliction of punishment, and would probably be considered by the party attacked as a dissolution of all previous compacts by which it might be bound."

Mr. Nicholas and those of his way of thinking had their way. Enforcement of federal taxation by coercion of a delinquent state found no place in the constitution of 1787-9; whilst direct taxes, as the *sole* resource, were feared as too provocative of opposition from the taxpayers. So there was adopted a form of taxing power that (comparatively) need not be "felt by the people." This is found in article I, section 8, clause 1, of the instrument: "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises," etc. True, the "taxes" named here include

*See, *inter alia*, Jefferson to Madison, August 2, 1787, Ford's "Writings of Thomas Jefferson," IV, 422.

†"Memoir, Correspondence and Miscellanies from the Papers of Thomas Jefferson," (1829), II, 43.

‡Elliot's *Debates*, V, 140.

direct taxes—those that are "felt" by the people; but by another provision of the federal constitution (article I, section 2, clause 3) direct taxes must be "apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers" (i. e., populations). Few and far between have been the direct taxes laid by the Congress. From the first it has relied chiefly upon the *unfelt* imposts and excises, but especially the imposts.

And for Mr. Nicholas' purposes this power of indirect taxation has worked like a charm. The central government has thriven under it. With a full treasury—often full to overflowing—it no longer plays beggar before the bankers of Europe.

But has this power, in its practical workings and its ultimate results, been an unmixed blessing? Let us see. "Easy come, easy go," is a saying as true as trite. These tax moneys, easily acquired and piled up in the treasury while still *unfelt by the people*, came, in course of events, to be almost as easily distributed again—but with this difference: the careless many, "unfeeling," paid in these taxes; the careful and calculating few, most feelingly, received them in the distribution. To mention a few of the ways in which this distribution has been accomplished (but not strictly in the chronological order of their first appearing): There are fat sinecures of "boards" and "commissions" galore to help Congress find out what Congress is supposed to be paid by the people to find out for itself; great and growing military pension lists by no means confined to worthy pensioners—and, wars and rumors of wars for furnishing fresh armies of pensioners, largely fomented by that same calculating few as truly thrifty patriots; fat war-time contracts made with easy-going federal officials; swarms of paid lobbyists and corruptionists around Congress in the interest of legislation favorable to the few at the expense of the many; mileage grabs and the like by the members of Congress themselves; palatial office buildings for these Congressional servants of the taxpayers, and costly governmental structures throughout the length and breadth of the land; last, but not least, wholesale and reckless "internal improvements", including the perennially scandalous "pork barrel" of rivers and harbors appropriations. Next, we may expect to see Washington implored to pour countless federal millions into the good roads project—a project that is most commendable in itself, but one that could

and should be undertaken by the several states and communities immediately interested, and that, so undertaken, could be made self-supporting, if not, indeed, a revenue producer.

In other words, during the approximate century and a quarter of the present federal constitution this "unfelt" indirect taxation has wrought its logical and perfect work of extravagance and the evils that follow in the train of extravagance. The power (and exercise) of indirect taxation is itself the first of five links in a fetter of tyranny; these links running thus in consecutive order: Indirect and *Unfelt* Taxation; Extravagance and Corruption; Centralization; Loss of Local Pride and Independence; Loss of Liberty itself. Whether all five are to be hammered out good and strong and fitly joined together for wreathing around fair Columbia's form, depends upon the vigilance or otherwise of the fair lady herself.

How far has the chain already progressed? As hinted above, one inevitable incident or result of this opulence and extravagance of the federal government is a pervasive, insidious, and ever growing encroachment of the central authority upon state and local rights and duties. And too often the local communities—yea, the states themselves—love to have it so. For this "there is a reason", as the advertiser expresses it. State and local enterprises and improvements require funds: these funds, as already seen, the central government has in abundance; the state governments and the municipalities have them not. And for this, too, the reason is readily forthcoming. The United States still obtain their revenues mostly through the unfelt, indirect taxation method; the states and municipalities tax directly, and these felt taxes are laid sparingly and paid grudgingly. More and more have we come to look to Washington to lend a glad and helping hand and generous purse for our state and local needs and desires. Here are just a few samples, culled almost at random from the newspapers of recent dates:

"Will teach farming at Colored schools. United States authorities to experiment with Miner fund in Alexandria county [state] schools"; "Work of grading and improving the grounds of the Clarendon [state] school, according to plans made by . . . a landscape gardener from the Department of Agriculture in Washington, is being rapidly pushed"; "In furtherance of her campaign to have the United States purchase the home of Thomas Jefferson,

Mrs. Martin W. Littleton made an address on 'The True Story of Monticello'; "Still another [of certain bills introduced into the Senate of the United States by Senator Martin, of Virginia,] appropriates \$100,000 for preliminary work in nationalizing as a great military park the famous battlefields of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, Spottsylvania Courthouse, Salem Church and the Wilderness, all on Virginia soil and all of them world-renowned. It is Senator Martin's idea that these battlefields should be taken over by the [federal] government and merged into one great memorial park. . . . An appropriation of \$5,000 is asked for by Senator Martin for the erection on Jamestown island, in Virginia, of a monument to the Indian princess, Pocahontas. A sum of \$2,000 is wanted in a separate bill for the erection of an iron fence around old Jamestown church ruins. A monument is proposed in an additional bill to Peyton Randolph, an early Virginia statesman. This is to be erected on the campus of William and Mary College, Williamsburg, if the \$15,000 asked for is granted."

And so the list might be increased *ad infinitum*, from a cursory scanning of the newspapers of these present days. The above samples are all Virginian items. In them all, federal aid (or interference) is sought in matters in every one of which the proud old commonwealth should be able and willing to act alone. Virginia-paid experts should teach Virginian farming to Virginian pupils in Virginia's public schools. And so as to the landscape gardener who is to beautify the grounds of Virginia's school yard—only, those officials would then have to be paid from taxes that are felt when paid. Why should not Virginia herself hold in trust for the public the Virginian homestead of Thomas Jefferson, the great apostle of local self-government? Who so fit as Virginia herself to erect on the campus of Virginia's own William and Mary College the effigy of Peyton Randolph, the "early Virginia statesman?" What so appropriate as that Virginia properly mark and preserve alike the site, on Virginia's soil, of the first permanent settlement of English-speaking colonists in America, and the (Virginian) ground made famous by the battled array of her own sons, with others, for home rule and constitutional liberty? Why, who, what, indeed?—if the sovereign state of Virginia only had the money.

Of a similar aspect is the current crusade for planting a United

States flag on every State-owned and (primarily) State-supported public school in the land. By all means hoist there the stars and stripes, if desired; but only in company with the State flag which, with or without the federal ensign, should fly from the roof-tree of every State school in the land to teach the youth of the community that it is their own fostering mother State who trains and educates them for State and federal citizenship.

The general situation is thus summed up by one wide-awake patriot of these latter days:*

" 'The great danger to the nation today is that the forty-eight sovereign states of this union are coming more and more to say, 'Oh, well, let George do it,' ' declared G. Grosvenor Dawe, editor of the *Nation's Business*, the publication issued by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in a lecture on 'Social Legislation.' . . . 'Many states are becoming less and less keen to the necessity of looking after their own internal affairs,' continued the speaker, 'the management of which was expressly conferred upon them by the constitution [rather, reserved by them in the constitution—L. T. E.] of the United States. Thus, state after state clamors for a federal soil survey, when such service ought to be performed by their own agencies.

" 'Every duty of this kind which the state should, but does not, attend to is weakening to that state, and hence to the nation. The tendency is to destroy the spirit of self-reliance, which is the only hope of strong state life. The clamor about states' rights is necessarily insincere so long as the states neglect states' duties. To this same neglect, moreover, is due the formation of a party pledged to the federal execution of social duties and of social legislation.' "

And what of the state legislatures, those one-time watchful and powerful representatives of the people? No student of American institutional history need be told of the supreme importance and authority of the state legislatures in the early days of the "confederated republic," as these United States were then styled—those days when, at one crisis of our affairs, Madison himself, who had served several terms in the Congress of the United States under the constitution of which he is nicknamed the father, and had been there a recognized leader, came as a delegate to the legislature of Virginia that he might, in such capacity, the better serve

**Washington Herald*, March 15, 1913.

his state and his country. And in the same news article which tells us of the above mentioned appropriation bills of Mr. Martin we are reminded that once Maryland and Virginia each furnished substantial sums of money to the United States government for the erection of the public buildings in the infant capital city, Washington.

But now—how have the mighty fallen! The dragon of Revelation, chapter 13, gave his power and his seat and great authority to the seven-headed beast. The states, those dragons of the Federalists or Constitutionlists of 1787, beginning almost from the day the constitution went into operation, have, in practice, surrendered more and more of their own proper power and authority to the central government—the creators to their creature. The creature, naturally enough, has seized greedily upon this proffered largess of power, and its appetite has grown with what it has fed upon. Moreover, to it has been given a mouth (the federal "Supreme Court") "speaking great things" against these shortsighted, pusillanimous creators: as, when it arrogates to itself the undelegated right to determine as against a sovereign state disputed questions of sovereignty arising between the creator state and the created central government, of which latter this self-appointed and self-anointed supreme arbiter is but one co-ordinate part. A new and dreadful Frankenstein tragedy is on the boards with a continent for its stage.

To such a degraded pass have things come that a paltry sixty-day or ninety-day biennial session is considered all that a modern state legislature should be allowed for actual legislating, as witness the present constitutions of Maryland and Virginia. And the pay of the legislators is in proportion, averaging, perhaps, \$500 a head per year or per session. This, too, at the very time when the federal Congress, handicapped by no constitutional restrictions in such matters, has recently raised its own already generous salary and, with frequent special sessions necessitated from the ever growing business of the country, has become well nigh a continuous body. Sixty, ninety, say a hundred days session in every two years for the legislative body of a sovereign state! No wonder our state legislation is largely hotch-potch and crazy quilt in character, and, as to the mechanical part,

thrown together without time even for proper proof-reading before enactment.*

Most timely is the comment from a live weekly journal of Virginia:†

"A bureau to draft bills for introduction into the national Congress has frequently been advocated. It is not half so necessary there as in the case of the state legislatures. Most Congressmen, even the new ones, are old at the business of legislating, or at least at the business of governing. They have usually gotten considerable practice at either handling or advocating legislation in other fields.

"But the state legislature, on the other hand, is a school for legislators. Men go there fresh from the plow shaft or the counting room. Once there, they find frequently the pressure of getting bills through so strong that there is little time for getting them into proper shape first."

To a somewhat different conclusion, apparently, from this Virginia editor, does Governor Hodges, of Kansas, come. Up pops this newly elected chief executive of the "Sunflower State" with the bland proposal that the legislature of Kansas be abolished entirely. As quoted in the daily press, he tells the legislature: "In a short session of fifty days you are required to study and pass upon hundreds of measures, and the hurry with which this must be done necessarily must result in a number of crude and ill-digested laws, which often puzzle learned jurists to interpret."

Just so, governor. A century or so ago the all-powerful state legislatures, as the agents of the people with practically plenary powers, supervised and sometimes themselves elected the governors of the states as both in fact and in name the chief executive officers—*i. e.*, the agents of these agents to execute their commands. Now we see one of these executives, as celestial trustee and lord high protector of the people, broadly hint that the legislature is a fifth wheel in the coach of state. And yet, remote though may be the danger at this present time, history teaches us that popular liberty is lost in just this way—by a surrender of the many-headed legislative branch to the single-headed execu-

*The writer had evidence of this several years ago in the matter of a bill he had introduced and passed by the legislature of Maryland, granting a municipal charter to a certain suburban community of that state. But for his visit to Annapolis and careful scrutiny in person of the engrossed copy of the bill, awaiting passage, numerous glaring errors would have remained in the text.

†*Alexandria County Monitor*, March 22, 1913.

tive; the very danger of which the "constitutional fathers" were so fearful, as the debates of those times will show.

And the remedy?

Lay the ax to the root of the tree. Away with federal indirect taxation, at any rate as the chief and prevailing mode of raising revenue. Substitute direct taxes—just how and in what form we need not here discuss; this should furnish much thought for the statesmanship of the immediate future. But impose taxes, state and federal, that are *felt by the people*. Let the citizen, state and federal, know, feel, and realize that *he* pays for running the government. So far as possible, let the state and federal governments co-operate in levying these taxes and share on some proper basis the proceeds between their respective treasuries, as was contemplated by certain of the constitutional fathers.* Take off the time limit for state, the same as already for federal, legislative sessions. Pay adequate salaries to our legislative representatives, thus making it worth the while of able and ambitious men to go to our legislatures, state and federal. Send such men to them. Furnish both such legislatures with adequate revenues, each for the governmental expenditures falling properly within their own sphere of legislative jurisdiction. And so restore at once actual home-rule with the spirit of local pride and independence, and in doing this re-establish on its true basis this confederate republic.

Nor need we fear overweening power by the state legislatures as a result of lengthened sessions and enlarged scope of official activity. The longer the session, the weaker the excuse for hurried legislation and the less the danger of jobbery, jokers, *et id omne genus*. Moreover, a powerful check and balance on the modern legislature is the *popular* initiative and referendum; just as, if generally recognized and practiced, we have a mighty check on Congressional usurpation or over activity in the *federal* initiative and referendum.†

The present Democratic administration is professedly a reform administration, and is morally pledged to a restoration of a decentralized and economical, but none the less efficient, régime. A splendid start has been made in the law enacted to scale down the

*See Elliot's *Debates*, original edition, II, 52-3, 70; III, 78, 81.

†See the article, "Federal Initiative and Referendum," in the *SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY*, October, 1912.

robber "protective" tariff to even less than a revenue basis, the deficiency in revenue to be made up by an income tax—a tax that will certainly be "felt" by the man who pays it. (And this does *not* mean a weakened federal government within the proper federal sphere. See the projected coöperation between the states and nation in the matter of storing the flood-waters of our great inland and interstate waterways as outlined by Secretary Lane of the Department of the Interior; likewise, the tactful and cordial co-working by President Wilson and Secretary Bryan with California, with reference to the anti-Japanese situation in that state.)

Will the good work, thus happily begun by the restorers of Jeffersonian principles to federal high places, be in time followed up in the way above discussed? Jefferson, the staunch "progressive" of his day, in his first inaugural address declared himself for "the support of the state governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and *the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies*; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad." In this blazed direction leads the path of the "new freedom"; in this way may we realize the hopes of the de-centralist, low taxationist, Hayne, for the perpetuation of "Liberty—the Constitution—Union", in behalf of "a free, a happy and a united people."*

*In the peroration of Hayne's second reply to Webster.

The New Economic Interpretation of Literary History.

ELBRIDGE COLBY

Proudfit Fellow in Letters, Columbia University.

New that the theory of the Economic Interpretation of History is well established, historians have begun to discover various allies of history in the social and physical sciences. They say that "history includes every trace and vestige of everything that man has done or thought since first he appeared on the earth. . . . all that we know of mankind regardless of the sources of the information." Thus they claim that "history is science, not a science," and that the historian has "gained the whole world without the loss of his own soul." And so they turn their attention to philosophy, geology, anthropology, biology; physics, and psychology. They have studied economics and have come to the conclusion that poor crops caused the Pilgrimage of Grace, that the Crusaders discovered America, and that Hargreaves and Arkwright conquered Napoleon.

When this idea had come to acceptance, the professors of literature in our various universities bestirred themselves from meticulously studying the much-mooted biographies of the great men of other days and from examining the progress of an idea like the *virtu* through successive periods. They roused themselves and looked about them. They said to one another, substantially: "Why cannot we find an underlying economic motive in our history as the historians have found one in the history of politics? We devote our lives to literature for money, is not that an economic motive? Men write books for money, is not that an economic motive?" And so they could ask many similar questions. Did not the lack of pecuniary encouragement for American authors during the first half of the century have a decided effect on the American literature of the period? In 1841 Matthew Carey, the Philadelphia publisher, wrote to Gilmore Simms to say: "We do not see much hope in the future for the American writer of light literature—as a matter of profit it might be abandoned." Were not economic motives in evidence here?

The basis of their theory has been stated as follows: "Food is a condition precedent to literature. . . . In every country and

in every age men of genius have been tempted to adventure themselves in that form of literature which seemed then and there to be most popular and therefore most likely to be profitable."^{*}

A little study on their part revealed several instances. There were no dramatic copyright arrangements between France and England at the beginning of the nineteenth century; and was it not due to the wholesale pirating of plays that English drama suffered a severe relapse and the English novel sprang into great prominence at about that time? They could refer to Dryden and show that those were purely financial reasons which moved him to change from poetry to drama, from drama to satire, from satire to translation. They could point out that from the earliest "scop" or minstrel until the days of dear old Doctor Johnson, a writer was naught but slave to this or that patron. James I had learned a certain style of poetry from a Scotch tutor and he took a deep interest in the verse, and had a widespread influence on the poets, of his time. Thus he was literary as well as political arbiter of his court, and the versifiers, as one of them said, were wont "to offer trembling songs to princely eares." They could point perchance to William Godwin, the slender, little, pale-faced man, dissenting minister, novelist, and archradical, who said frankly, with reference to one of his novels. "I was more or less determined by mercantile considerations." They could point to the conditions of composition which were forced upon Anthony Trollope or to Mrs. Oliphant, "the shadowy novelist of the nineteenth century, who sighed for greatness and had to write for money, and who looked wistfully out of her little world upon the achievements of George Eliot."

So they could go on and on. And what would come of it? Professor Matthews and his colleagues will in the end have presented some very interesting and very excellent theories, but their theories must always remain theories. They can prove nothing. They will be limited to the making of generalizations which might easily be proven false through the presence of a plurality of causes. They can merely suggest and suppose and approximate. A man may say that he writes a book primarily for money, but there are always other motives and the other motives are the most important. Unless a man know a subject, unless he have

^{*}"The Economic Interpretation of Literary History," by Brander Matthews, in *Gateways to Literature*, New York, 1912.

some definite ideas about what he writes, unless he strive for an ideal, his book is just to that degree worthless.

It seems that the professors of literature take the wrong attitude. The very instances to which they point, as well as innumerable others, disprove their contention that the remuneration, whether from the public or from a patron, is the underlying motive in determining the substance and the spirit, though it may determine the manner of presentation. To the present writer it seems that we should not make too much of the external form of literature. It does not make so great a difference whether expression is through the play, the novel, the essays, or in metrics. It is the ideal expressed with which we should concern ourselves—the ideal after which the writer patterns and toward which the writer strives;—thus, we think of Barry Cornwall and Thomas Love Peacock and Francis Jeffrey as elements in the classical reaction rather than as men with entirely different attitudes toward life, poetical, novelistic, and critical. And is it not this external form Professor Matthews emphasizes?

As far as the patron is concerned, it must be admitted by all who will make a study of the matter that the patron has very little influence on the output. Because James I had accomplished the royal monopoly of dramatic patronage, and because he was himself a poet of more than mediocre ability who took particular interest in things literary and poetic, he exerted a far more important influence than any man before or since. The average patron, however, was not considered until the book was written and the time had come to print the page which should contain the dedication. Patronage was in those days merely a form of scholarly encouragement and literary advertisement, somewhat analogous to the present establishments of endowed fellowships. The dedication of a book was nothing more or less than the bestowal of a compliment that had been bought and paid for, after the book itself had been independently composed, and the few instances that can be pointed out as exceptions to this general rule show an influence very very slight indeed.

Then, too, no poet of any worth, no writer of any worth, is content to be patronized. His genius must be free. The revolt of the true artist with his heart in his work,—and it must be remembered that the true artist with his heart in his work is the only one that can make any real contribution to our literature, to

our consciousness and appreciation of ourselves and the world about us,—the revolt of the true artist, I say, has scarcely been better expressed than in the reply of Cyrano de Bergerac to a suggestion that he swallow his pride and principle and "lay aside his soul for a fortune." He says:

" . . . And what should a man do? Seek some grandee, take him him for a patron, and like the obscure creeper clasping a tree-trunk, and licking the bark of that which props it up, attain to height by craft instead of by strength. No, I thank you. Dedicate, as they all do, poems to financiers? Work to construct a name on the basis of a sonnet, instead of constructing other sonnets? No, I thank you. Calculate, cringe, peak, prefer making a call to a poem,—petition, solicit, apply? No, I thank you! No, I thank you! No, I thank you! But . . . sing, dream, laugh, loaf, be single, be free, have eyes that look squarely, a voice with a ring; wear, if he chooses, his hat hindside afore; for a yes, for a no, fight a duel or turn a ditty. . . . Work, without concern of fortune or of glory, to accomplish the heart's-desired journey to the moon! Put forth nothing that has not its spring in the very heart."

Does not this ring true, would not any artist worth while feel as Cyrano felt and do his work irrespective of a patron?

On the other hand, as far as the public is concerned, the professors of literature seem to be wrong there also. William Godwin was a very inferior novelist and a very distinguished political philosopher. It was even said that he was not prosecuted for the radicalism of "Political Justice" because the book was little sold at the high price, and yet that narrowly circulated volume constituted his contribution to posterity. His heart and soul were in the work;—he put it together in an incredibly short time and sold it practically at cost. Its influence, greater than that of anything else he ever wrote, and his influence through personal intimacies with radical writers of the romantic period, were not paid for in any fashion. Thomas Paine wrote not for money when he penned the "Rights of Man," and "Common Sense," or when he dashed off the burning words of the first "Crisis": "These are the times that try men's souls."

Let us go back for a moment to a book of different character from that of American Revolutionary pamphlets. "Carrying ourselves back in thought to the fourteenth century we shall find that the name of Francesco Petrarca stands for a revolution in European thought. His existence, character, and career consti-

tuted in themselves, as has been said of Voltaire, a new and prodigious era. His was the most potent individual influence in changing the whole trend of intellectual pursuits, not only in his own country but ultimately in Europe at large." Could it be said of the monumental work of Petrarch in the inception of Humanism, and of Voltaire's work in the popularization of Rationalism, that they were undertaken for the financial rewards? The merely "popular" works which make financial success are never the really important ones. With Petrarch, for instance, to him his "sonnets seemed little more than a youthful diversion. They earned for him, as he admits, a despised notoriety among the illiterate multitude, but could never constitute the foundation of a scholar's fame." Finally, to present a last example, Doctor Johnson, who called any man "a fool who wrote for anything but the need of cash," in spite of what he said has made his chief contributions to posterity in unpurchased and unpurchasable personal influence which he exerted. The best piece of writing he ever did was a furious, angry letter to Lord Chesterfield.

The transition to a state of freedom from patronage and from dependence on the public can hardly be said to have been complete until the nineteenth century, and consideration of the literary work and of the writers of that period disproves the theory of Professor Matthews all too conclusively. Wordsworth, Keats, Byron, Shelley, Tennyson, Rossetti, Ruskin, Morris, and Swinburne, all had the time and the money, as well as the inclination,—or had it given to them,—to devote themselves absolutely to their chosen work to the exclusion of other interests. Hawthorne, Lowell, Longfellow, and Emerson were supported independent of their writings,—the first by his work in the customs-service, the last by his lectures, the other two by university professorships. Economic considerations moulded the form of the writings of none of these men in England or in America and can only be said to have afforded the opportunity. But then, says Professor Matthews, the very opportunity is created or destroyed by economic considerations, by the worldly welfare of the writer. That may be true; but it must be remembered that this creation or destruction has to do with all writers alike, and chiefly it must be remembered that the poet or author is a creature of mood, and that the character of these moods arises from the character of the poet or author and not from his financial condition. The

poet who writes for money and the poet who writes for pleasure are alike in that they turn to writing rather than to other things, and their turning to that field is through their own personal preferences and inclinations and not external economic considerations.

Poe is the best example we have of a genius prevented from full development by unfavorable conditions. We are told his one shortcoming as an author was, that he never wrote a novel when, poor man, he never got a chance. Always just out of the clutches of poverty, he lived from hand to mouth and, if there ever was a day-laborer with a pen, that was Poe. So of course his stories were short, so of course he was prevented from expressing all he had to express. Poe himself tells how little his financial status tended to turn the bent of his genius, check it as it might. He prefaced the 1845 edition, the last collected edition, of his poems with the following:

"I think nothing in this volume of much value to the public, or very creditable to myself. Events not to be controlled have prevented me from making, at any time, any serious effort in what, under happier circumstances, would have been the field of my choice. With me poetry has not been a purpose, but a passion; and the passions should be held in reverence; they must not—they cannot at will be excited, with an eye to the paltry compensations, or the more paltry commendations of mankind."

And yet he wrote on. If, when a man seeks to gain the whole world he loses his own soul, far better would it have been for art that like Poe, as had been said of Gerard de Nerval, the poet had "lost the whole world and gained his own soul."

We will look, then, at some more evidence which the geniuses themselves have brought to show how little they care for gaining the world. Arthur O'Shaughnessy has sung in an ode:

"We are the music-makers
And we are the makers of dreams,
Wandering by lone sea-breakers,
And sitting by desolate streams,
World-losers and world-forsakers,
On whom the pale moon gleams:
Yet we are the movers and shakers
Of the world forever, it seems.

With wonderful deathless ditties
We build up the world's great cities,
And out of a fabulous story
We fashion an empire's glory:
One man with a dream, at pleasure,
Shall go forth and conquer a crown;
And three with a new song's measure
Can trample a kingdom down."

Poe wrote in the preface to "Eureka";

"To the few who love me and whom I love—to those who feel rather than to those who think—to the dreamers and those who put faith in dreams as in the only realities—I offer this book of Truths, not in its character of Truth-Teller, but for the Beauty that abounds in its Truth, constituting it true."

Emma Goldman was once criticized for being a visionary, an idealist, a dreamer, because she would draw up no anarchistic platform for the future, no system which could be imposed upon posterity. Her reply was characteristic: "I hope I am a dreamer. In the labouring classes, the 'conscious minority', dreamers if you will, are those to whom we shall look for salvation, and I have noticed that every great reformer of the past was called a visionary and a dreamer in his own time. I'm glad you called me a dreamer!"

Arthur O'Shaughnessy, Edgar Allan Poe, and Miss Goldman compose a strange trio; but the three statements illustrate the idea; and they illustrate it from the point of view of the writer himself. Sidney said, "Look in thy heart and write;" and always the writer has preferred to lay his heart beside the paper and copy;—the thought, if true, may transform the world.

It is the dreamer like Hamlet who has opportunity to live inasmuch as he does not act, who has time to contemplate the broad face of things and to learn that "something is rotten in the state of Denmark." The man who would come to a proper consciousness and appreciation, and who would express the ideals of his fellows and the world about him must have time to think and must have a proper amount of perspective. The great men, the strong men, of other years have had social hearts but have lived in solitude. And so it is best that the writing should be for the writer a vocation rather than an avocation; that his sole interest should lie in the interpretation of the great forces of humanity.

An examination of the records we have, shows that the greatest geniuses have all developed irrespective of any economic interference and that—while cold, hard economic fact may have been of importance in some individual cases—it had little bearing on the trend of literature as a whole. It is true that a novelist, the same as the playwright, must suit his piece to the taste of his audience. So, Nash, Peele, Lodge, and Greene, young university wits of Elizabethan days, moulded their classical material to meet popular demands. So the novelist has done. And this provides us with the truth that, to whatever degree popular demands have moulded the literature of the past, just by that much more can a man be taken as typical of his time. His view of conditions or of ideals must be true or it will not be accepted. But it is the popular fancy, the popular ideals, that place the limitations on the product; and popular fancies and popular ideals are susceptible to change. They change from age to age; and, though the alteration in each separate case is slight, they change at the behest of "the dreamers of dreams" instead of placing themselves rigid economic barriers about the geniuses who wield the pens and who at once serve and lead. In the words of Shelley: "Poets, not otherwise than philosophers, painters, sculptors, and musicians are, in one sense, the creators, and, in another, the creations of their age."

Thus the personality of the poet has weight as well as the immediate surroundings,—a great of weight. Even Professor Matthews himself says, in his closing paragraph: "He who possesses the potentiality of becoming one of the great men of literature . . . born out of time or place . . . will rise superior to circumstances, either because he is supple enough to adapt himself to them, or because he is strong enough to conquer them, turning into a stepping stone the obstacle which weaker creatures find only a stumbling block."

Would it not be best to dismiss any such proffered attempt at an "economic interpretation of literary history" through scattered and unrelated individual conditions? Would it not be advisable to consider literature, not merely in relation to its social background—as Taine would have us—but as a result of that society. The ideals of the writer are influenced by the society in which he lives, and so the output. In like manner, the society itself has resulted from certain economic forces and conditions.

All is bound together; every particle of matter in the universe is affected by an eyelid that closes or a thought that springs to birth. Each man, even the idealist, is in close connection with his own times—the idealist is not apart: he merely marches in the advance guard of the age. So, as economic laws govern human, social conditions in turn, forming as they do the chiefest part of his environmental education, govern the output of the writer.

In some such way, perchance, "some gentle scholar of an hundred years hence" may draw together many scattered threads and be able to formulate theories which shall mean much to us in our study of literature and life. The investigator may show, for instance, the real relation between an age of great national and commercial expansion and an accompanying outburst of lyric poetry, and the causal connection between the two. Here is food for thought, at the least. We believe that this would be a bigger and broader and better, especially a more useful, "interpretation" than one founded on accidental "economic possibilities" in the case of different writers,—the individual's financial status in Grub Street, if you will.

So, there *can* be an "economic interpretation", though less definite, in a greater and more fundamental sense than Professor Matthews has said. In the broad synthesis and general survey, we see clearly; while in the single instance, we grope darkly face to face. This interpretation would be linked with the spirit of the age; not with exotic trivialities. It would deal with things which have influenced the trends and tendencies of literature as a whole, rather than deal with casual, accidental, and isolated circumstances. It would concern itself with fundamentals not with inessentials; with the inspiration, not with the book-seller's goad. Such we propose as the true "economic interpretation of literary history."

England and the Home-Rule Question

WINIFRED MAHON
University of Michigan

For more than six centuries England has had her "Irish question," a question which earlier policies of repression and later attempts at conciliation have alike been unable to solve. Each generation has had to work out a new Irish policy because the generation before had failed. In our own time the idea of "governing Ireland in accordance with Irish ideas" has taken form in such measures as the land and local government acts with the Unionist party, and in the three Home-Rule bills with the Liberals. The third of these, the Government of Ireland Bill, was introduced into the House of Commons in April of last year.

From the time when the English first began to invade Ireland in the twelfth century until the middle of the eighteenth century, their policy was repressive. Not only did they take the land away from the native Irish, but they gradually assumed more and more political power, until they almost completely dominated the Irish Parliament. Thus they required that all proposed Irish measures should be submitted to the Privy Council at Westminster before being introduced into an Irish parliament, and finally, in 1720, declared their right to legislate for Ireland independently of the parliament at Dublin. Even in their own parliament, which still kept some of its power, the native Irish had little voice, for the religious troubles, which came with the Reformation, had given rise to such violent feeling that the great majority of the Irish people, who had remained Catholic, were deprived of almost all political rights, and had to submit to government by a Protestant minority. In economic matters, too, Ireland felt the heavy hand of the English legislators, for her chief industries were destroyed, and the people, thus thrown back upon the land, were forced to live under a wholly inadequate and unjust system of land-holding. The beginning of the eighteenth century found Ireland in a condition of desolate depression, which is almost inconceivable.

When the outlook seemed darkest, however, new considerations appeared which led England to adopt a policy of conciliation in place of the repression which had thus proved a failure. The

Irish, both of the north and south, stung by the wrongs of their country, and united by their common grievances, became conscious of their nationality, and clamored for a free parliament. At the same time, the English came to see wherein they had been at fault in the past. The result was a short period of partial political independence, beginning in 1742, in which the powers of the Irish Parliament were largely restored, although Catholics were still excluded. When the dissatisfaction of the majority of the Irish people led to the rebellion of 1798, England, feeling the need of concentration on account of the Napoleonic wars, ended the whole matter by the Act of Union, in 1800, which abolished the parliament at Dublin, and proposed to govern Ireland through the British Parliament, to which one hundred Irish members were to be admitted.

The course of the nineteenth century saw religious and economic changes, but the political situation remained practically unaltered. The Catholic disabilities were done away with; the Irish church was disestablished; and the agrarian troubles, which had been steadily growing worse, were remedied to a large extent, at first by the legislation of the Liberal party, and later by the Unionist policy of land purchase. On the other hand, although the Irish incessantly demanded political independence, no concessions were made in this direction, two Home-Rule Bills, in 1886 and 1893, failing to pass into law. These measures, which were introduced by the Liberals, seem to have been brought forward partly from a sincere belief in the wisdom of Home-Rule, and partly as a reward to the Irish party, the Nationalists, for their support. Both bills proposed to set up a separate parliament in Ireland,—the chief difference being that the earlier bill gave Ireland no representation at Westminster, while the later bill provided for eighty Irish members to sit in the imperial parliament.

With the defeat of the second Home-Rule bill, in 1893, the nineteenth century, which had been ushered in by the Act of Union, came to a close, as far as the Irish question was concerned; the solution seemingly as far away as ever. In the last twenty years, however, the situation has changed, and the Irish are looking eagerly for the outcome of a third Home-Rule bill, proposed, as before, by the Liberal party. In order to understand the present political condition in England, we must look at the peculiar position of the Irish party, the reasons which made them join forces

with the English Liberals, and the circumstances in view of which the Liberal party decided once more to champion the Home-Rule cause.

Political and economic agitation had assumed large proportions by the beginning of the present century. The Unionists, who were in power, passed a number of Crimes Acts, putting the country practically under military discipline, in order to suppress the boycotting and cattle-driving to which the Irish had resorted in their efforts to show dissatisfaction with the imperfect working of the land acts. But instead of quieting matters, these measures only reacted to make the feeling against England stronger. This feeling was quite as evident in political as in economic affairs. Although the Unionists had originated land purchase in Ireland, and had, in 1898, granted local government similar to that in England, they were unwilling to go farther, and were afraid to grant concessions, for fear that such steps might involve Home-Rule. The dissatisfaction in Ireland arising from this was aggravated, furthermore, by what the Nationalists declared was a neglect of Irish affairs by an overworked parliament. Having tried boycotting and cattle-driving to no effect, the Irish felt that the only thing left for them to do, short of rebellion, was to continue the agitation for Home-Rule, and in the meantime to "obstruct" the work of Parliament in the hope that their demands might be listened to through sheer desperation.

As a means of deliverance, the Irish Nationalists turned to their old allies, the Liberals; not so much because the policies of the two parties were identical, as because, having learned the futility of asking help from the Unionists, they felt that the Liberals might possibly be brought to support Home-Rule a third time. As a matter of fact, the Irish were generally credited with having more in common with the Unionists as far as such matters as peasant proprietorship and tariff reform were concerned, but they chose to sink these interests in the greater question of a national parliament; and here, while the Unionists were unyielding, the Liberals, on the other hand, were by tradition and to a large extent by conviction in favor of Home-Rule. Gladstone had been its great champion, and after his death, the policy found strong advocates in such men as Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and the two secretaries for Ireland, Mr. Birrell and Mr. Bryce, and had, moreover, a vigorous, though small, support in the

House of Lords. It was natural, therefore, that the Irish should turn to the Liberals rather than to the Unionists.

But in spite of such protestations, there were a number of reasons which led to the postponement of the Home-Rule question until after the Liberals had been in power for six years. In the first place, they seem to have mistrusted popular opinion in this regard, for they avoided reference to the subject, as much as possible, in their election speeches, evidently fearing defeat if they championed the cause; and a number of the present supporters of the bill were forced to pledge themselves to use their influence against such a step in order to keep their seats in Parliament. The Unionists, however, seem to have dragged Home-Rule before the country on every occasion in the hope that their opposition to it might turn popular feeling in their favor.

Even had the country at large been in sympathy with Home-Rule, the House of Lords would have been an effective obstacle. Up to 1911, when the Parliament Act was passed, the House of Lords had power to veto measures which came before it, no matter how unmistakably the people might have expressed their wishes in the elections. It was in this manner that the Home-Rule bill of 1893 was lost, for the great majority of the Lords were then, as now, strict Unionists in theory. If it would have been difficult to get such a measure through the House of Commons, it was generally agreed that it would be impossible to have it pass the House of Lords.

While the uncertainty of popular opinion, the overruling power of the House of Lords, and also the demands of the other parts of the empire, kept the Home-Rule question from coming to issue for several years, other considerations at length made it necessary to appease the Nationalists in order to keep their support. The general elections of 1906 gave the Liberals such a small majority in the House of Commons that they maintained their power chiefly by the Irish vote. Being thus under obligation to the Nationalists, but knowing as well that a Home-Rule bill was inexpedient at the time, the Liberals tried to compromise, in the hope that the Irish would take what was offered, without insisting on the full measure of self-government.

The compromise was the scheme of "devolution." This term had already become familiar in political theory. In principle, it meant the delegation to each separate part of the kingdom of the

affairs which concerned that part and that part only,—at the same time leaving the supreme control over all with the imperial parliament. Devolution had become famous through the efforts of the Irish Reform Association, as a certain group of Unionists were called, who, in 1904, had proposed a form of self-government for Ireland, which met with little favor: chiefly, because it was too radical for the Unionists, yet insufficient for the Nationalists. When the King's Speech in 1906 and again in 1907 announced the intention of the Liberals to make some concession to Ireland, the Unionists foresaw that it would be in the direction of devolution, and the terms of the bill itself, which was brought in, in May, 1907, proved that they were right. This Irish Council Bill, as it was called, proposed to establish a council in Ireland, of which most of the members were to be elected and the others nominated. This council was to have charge of the work theretofore done by the principal Irish executive boards, such as the Local Government Board and the Commissioners of Public Education.

The bill, however, like the suggestions of the Irish Reform Association, satisfied neither the Nationalists nor the Unionists. Although the Liberals insisted that it was rather an experiment than a step towards Home-Rule, the Unionists objected "not only to the big hole for the cat, but also to the little hole for the kitten." The Nationalists, on the other hand, seem to have felt the danger of accepting anything short of full Home-Rule. While Mr. Redmond and his followers voted for the bill after the first reading, they did not pretend to be satisfied. The veto of the Lord Lieutenant, which was the principal safeguard in the bill, took away what little power was offered; there were no privileges in regard to taxation, and no adequate substitute for the parliament the Irish were demanding. Moreover, the Irish declared that the scheme was unworkable. So strong was their feeling that when the Liberals and Nationalists decided to submit the bill to a convention of the Irish people, a unanimous vote against it caused the whole matter to be dropped. Clearly, the Irish would not accept a small measure of devolution.

In the course of events, however, certain obstacles which had prevented the earlier introduction of a Home-Rule bill disappeared, and other circumstances arose which led the Liberals to support the cause again. To be sure, public opinion remained un-

certain, and the elections of 1909 and 1910 were won on other issues; but, on the other hand, the Lords' veto, which had been such a formidable obstacle, was done away with in 1911. Although the passage of the Parliament Bill involved the acceptance of a Budget which was not at all welcome to Ireland, the Nationalists voted for it, partly because they were anxious to get rid of the veto and partly because they saw an opportunity for making the Liberals indebted to them. The chief provisions of the Parliament Act were: first, that a money bill, passed by the House of Commons, should become law one month after being sent to the House of Lords, with or without the consent of that body; and second, that other public bills (with two exceptions) should become law, without the consent of the Lords, provided they should be passed by the Commons in three successive sessions. Thus what was perhaps the chief objection to bringing in a Home-Rule bill, from the Irish point of view, was removed.

Whether or not these changes alone were powerful enough to bring Home-Rule to the front again, the strategic importance to the Liberals of the Irish vote made the result almost inevitable. The parliamentary situation was such that the support of the Nationalists was absolutely essential to the Liberals. It was to be expected, therefore, that the two parties would join forces with a more or less definite agreement that if the Nationalists voted for Liberal measures, the Liberals, in their turn, would vote for Home-Rule.

The changed attitude of the Nationalists and the Irish people had been preparing for just such an alliance. The intense anti-English feeling that prevailed in Ireland at the time of the Boer war, and in lesser degree thereafter, is almost incredible. Mr. Redmond and his followers said again and again that the only reason they did not encourage armed rebellion was that it would be hopeless. There was trouble over the King's visit to Ireland, over the coronation, over service in the British army, and frequent instances are recorded where the Irish refused to sing the national anthem. But when the Liberals came into power, the attitude of the Irish gradually changed, and became peaceful, if not friendly. After 1906, public demonstrations against England were less and less frequent; Nationalists and Liberals stood together on the great issues in Parliament; and when the Government of Ireland Bill was finally introduced in 1912, the Irish peo-

ple accepted it as a token of goodwill, and not as something altogether forced upon the government.

As for the alliance between the Liberals and the Nationalists, it is impossible to say when or on what terms it was definitely formed. The Unionists were only too anxious to discover a bargain, and seldom lost an opportunity for saying that one existed, while their opponents as often denied it. There was a good deal of evidence pointing toward it, however. Thus, the Liberals and Nationalists voted together for the Irish Council Bill and the Budget, although the first measure was as obnoxious to many of the Liberals as the second was to the Nationalists. While Irish support of the Parliament Bill was not in itself a sufficient proof, the frequent promises that Home-Rule would be the first measure introduced after its passage indicated that there had been some sort of understanding between the two parties. Such, at least, was the opinion of the Unionists, both at this time and afterwards.

In view of these circumstances, no one was surprised when it was announced in the King's speech in February, 1912, that the Liberals intended to bring in a Home-Rule bill that session. Together with the fact that nothing was said about the reconstruction of the House of Lords, which had been virtually promised before the Parliament Act was passed, this statement thoroughly aroused the Opposition. The Unionists accused the Liberals of taking advantage of a temporarily paralyzed upper chamber to push Home-Rule through, without submitting it to the people. In reply, the Liberals insisted that nothing was to be gained by reconstructing the House of Lords then, since the displacement arising later from Home-Rule would throw out the whole scheme and necessitate further reconstruction. It was argued again that Home-Rule was really a part of any systematic change, and, finally, that the Liberals were bound to begin with this measure, because they had promised in the last election that they would do so, as soon as the Parliament Bill should become law.

The third Home-Rule bill, which was introduced in April, 1912, differs from the other two to some extent in its terms, but particularly in principle; for like the proposals of the Irish Reform Association, and like the Irish Council Bill of 1907, though to a greater extent, it pretends to be an attempt to relieve an over-worked parliament by devolution. The Liberals declare that

Home-Rule for Ireland is but one step in a "larger and more comprehensive policy," by which all the different parts of the United Kingdom are to be given self-government in the affairs which affect only themselves. Thus, after Ireland is made self-governing, there will also be parliaments in Scotland, in Wales, and in England itself, which will take care of the concerns of these countries, leaving matters of imperial importance in the hands of the parliament at Westminster, which will, by this means, be made more efficient. While the agitation has been almost entirely confined to the one country, the Liberals seem to expect that it will spread to the others, as it appears to have done already in the case of Scotland. Even if they are no more sincere in this than the Unionists give them credit for being, it is significant that Home-Rule has appeared as a part of an empire-wide scheme.

Turning to the Bill itself, we find it somewhat complicated. The general plan is much like that of the earlier Bills,—*i. e.*, there is to be an Irish parliament, but a parliament subject to the overruling supremacy of the imperial parliament, to which, in the case of the present Bill, forty-two Irish members will be returned. This supremacy of the imperial parliament is asserted at the beginning. "The supreme power and authority," the text reads, "of the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall remain unaffected and undiminished over all persons, matters, and things within His Majesty's dominions." To secure this supremacy, three safeguards are provided later in the Bill: in the first place, the imperial parliament reserves the right to pass laws for Ireland just as for any other part of the Kingdom; in the second place, it can alter or make void acts passed by the parliament at Dublin; and finally, the Lord Lieutenant is given the power to veto or postpone the operation of any Irish act.

While the Irish parliament, subject to these three checks, "shall have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of Ireland," it is by no means to control all affairs relating to that country. Besides the usual prerogatives of a sovereign, the imperial parliament is to have control of certain other matters, known as "reserved services." Some of these "services,"—the management of the land-purchase acts, the collection of all taxes, imperial or Irish, and the care of public loans,—are to be permanently reserved. Others, such as the control of old age pensions, national insurance, and postoffice savings banks, may be

turned over to the Irish parliament after a specified time, which varies with the different services from one to ten years. Special provision is made for the constabulary, which shall become an Irish service after six years. The Bill furthermore forbids the establishment of any religion in Ireland.

The parliament, which is to legislate for Ireland under these limitations, is to be made up of two chambers: the Senate and the House of Commons. The Upper House will have forty members, serving for eight years, and retiring in rotation; but instead of being elected, as the former Bills provided, they are to be nominated,—in the first instance by the king, and thereafter by the Irish Ministers, both speaking through the Lord Lieutenant. In the House of Commons, on the other hand, there are to be one hundred and sixty-four members, distributed by a new schedule and elected by the regular parliamentary electors, unless the qualifications are changed by the Irish parliament, as they may be after three years. All money bills are to originate in the House of Commons, and the Senate, like the Imperial House of Lords, may neither reject nor amend such bills. In case the Senate rejects any other bill in two successive sessions, the two chambers are to sit together and vote as one body.

As for the executive authority, it is to be vested, as far as the Irish services are concerned, in the Lord Lieutenant, who is to be appointed by the king, regardless of religious belief, for a term of six years, but "without prejudice to the power of His Majesty at any time to revoke the appointment." Under him are to be the Irish Departments, whose heads are to be the Irish Ministers, or "Executive Committee of the Privy Council of Ireland," as they are called in the Bill. As for the reserved services and other matters remaining within the province of the imperial parliament, the authority is to rest with the king, as at present.

By far the most complicated part of the Bill is that devoted to finance. The reason for this is largely because the government of Ireland is being carried on at a loss, the present annual deficit being something like £150,000. Disregarding the less important details, including those dealing with customs duties, the general plan outlined in the Bill is as follows: All taxes, by whichever parliament they are levied, are to be paid into the imperial exchequer, from which the reserved services will be paid for and a certain amount given to an Irish exchequer every year for the

support of the Irish services. This "Transferred Sum," as it is called, includes (1) an amount equal to the present cost of the Irish services, (2) an additional £500,000 (later to be reduced to £200,000), and (3) an amount equal to the taxes imposed by the Irish parliament. If the Irish government wish to increase this Transferred Sum, they have only to raise the rate of an existing tax, Irish or Imperial, or to impose a new one, in which case the addition will count as an Irish tax, and thus be included in the Transferred Sum; on the other hand, if they wish to reduce or remove a tax, the Transferred Sum will be reduced proportionately. The management of the whole financial system is left to a joint exchequer board, consisting of two members from the Imperial and two members from the Irish Treasury, with a chairman appointed by the king.

In general, the constituencies which the Liberals and Nationalists represented seemed to look upon the Bill as the best measure possible under the circumstances. There was, however, more or less discontent with certain provisions,—notably, the nomination of the senators and the financial arrangements. This first objection was settled later when the Bill was altered so as to make the senators elective after five years, but the open dissatisfaction with the financial provisions availed nothing. The Irish felt that they should be allowed to collect their own taxes, and that they should be given control of all services relating exclusively to Ireland, particularly the postoffice and the more vital matter of land purchase. As a whole, however, the Bill was received with enthusiasm, and was accepted by a convention of the Irish people called for the purpose.

The Unionists, on the other hand, fell upon the Bill as soon as it was introduced, and proceeded to find fault with it: partly because of the particular terms of the Bill, and partly because of their hostility to the whole principle of Home-Rule,—an hostility which they based largely on the resistance of Ulster. They left scarcely one provision uncondemned. The supremacy of the imperial parliament was dismissed as a "dead letter;" the safeguards, if used, they said, would only serve to bring about a situation similar to that before the union; should the Lord Lieutenant exercise his veto, the Irish government would have to resign, only to be returned again at the general elections. They further attacked the powers of legislation given to the Irish parliament; in

the first place, because they were defined "not by enumeration, but by restriction," and, in the second place, because they seemed to have been chosen arbitrarily, without any consistent basis of division. This last objection applied equally well to the powers of the executive. It was pointed out, for example, that while land purchase was a reserved service, rent was to be fixed by the Irish government. The financial arrangements were especially disliked. The plan by which the king was to appoint the chairman of the Joint Exchequer Board was called both unconstitutional and unfair; the £500,000 included in the Transferred Sum as a "free gift to the Irish people" was taken to mean higher taxes for the British public; and the lesser details were vigorously attacked. Altogether, the Unionists looked upon the Bill as an arbitrary and unworkable compromise between the Liberals and the Nationalists.

The question of Ulster was really of wider significance. The people who live in this part of Ireland are largely descended from the old Scotch covenanters, and are strongly Protestant. Although in Ireland, as a whole, there are four times as many Catholics as Protestants, in some districts of Ulster there are four times as many Protestants as Catholics,—a situation which has greatly aggravated the intense religious intolerance for which Ireland has always been noted. Moreover, the economic history of Ulster, also, has been such as to cut her off from the rest of the island. This is the only part of Ireland where industry has been profitable. Whether it is the result of the natural ability of the people, as the Unionists like to think, or of the partiality of parliament in giving special commercial privileges, as the Nationalists insist, certainly the less fortunate districts have had cause for jealousy.

However, this may be, the people of Ulster are, and have been for many years, as violently opposed to Home-Rule as the rest of the Irish have been eager for it. Not only do they fear Catholic ascendancy—"Rome rule," as they say,—but they prophesy that the economic needs of the north and south are so different, and often so contradictory that the minority in Ulster would surely suffer at the hands of their southern rivals. So strong has the feeling been that the members of parliament who sit for Ulster have not only been constantly fighting the introduction of a Home-Rule Bill, but have, when such a step has seemed imminent,

used threats of armed resistance. As early as 1911 plans were made for a provisional government in Ulster in case the union were "disrupted," and the opposition increased with the appearance of the bill itself. Both English and Irish Unionists used the situation in Ulster as one of their strongest arguments against Home-Rule. They said, in the first place, that the Liberals were trying to impose upon one-fourth of the population of Ireland a form of government which they neither wanted nor needed, and, in the second place, that the Irish Unionists, by resisting it, were showing a spirit of loyalty to the Empire which the Nationalists had forgotten. The suggestion was made that Ulster be excepted from the provisions of the Government of Ireland Bill, but this plan met with little approval. In view of these considerations, then, the Unionists felt that the position of Ulster was a decisive argument against the Bill.

All this opposition, however, has been unavailing up to the present time and seems likely to be so in the future. The Bill passed the House of Commons in January, 1913, by a safe majority, and was sent to the Lords, who refused to pass it, as had been expected. Here the provisions of the Parliament Act step in to save the situation for the Irish, for if the Bill passes the Commons in the next two sessions, the veto of the Lords will become ineffective, and it will be enacted without their consent. The present situation would seem to indicate that events will take this course. The opposition of Ulster, in Ireland, and of the Unionists and conservative people generally, in England, seems to be over-balanced by the enthusiastic support of the rest of the Irish, who have won the sympathy of the world in their struggle for freedom, of the Liberals and progressive people, and also, as far as can be judged, of the common people in England. Unless a general election should put the Unionists in power, as is unlikely, the Liberals will doubtless bring the Bill up in 1913 and 1914 until it becomes law.

Whether or not the Government of Ireland Bill, if passed, will solve the Irish question, one may not say now. The important thing to be noted is that the Irish are to be given their first opportunity to work out, as a nation, their own problems of government. Before England took matters into her own hands, when the Irish still had some political power, they were not united by any sense of nationality as they are now, while, on the

other hand, since they have been thus united, the people, as a whole, have never been given a fair trial in self-government. That the Bill has shortcomings is to be expected, inasmuch as it had to be a compromise on many points. The Irish, however, are willing to overlook the defects, satisfied if their efforts of two centuries are rewarded. The Irish question is too long-standing and too complex to be solved in a day; there are likely to be some aspects of it that have escaped notice, and others that have been misinterpreted; all we can ask is that the Irish be given the opportunity for which they have long been asking. It may be that the solution of the Irish question is to be found in Home-Rule, but, on the other hand, this may not be so. The outcome must rest with Ireland herself.

The Federation of the World

ALFRED HAYES

Professor of Law in Cornell University

Law has been the world's great peacemaker. When man painfully emerges from the life of the jungle, force slowly ceases to be the sole test of right. Men learn to live together in the family and the tribe. Barbaric traits persist; fighting between individuals and groups is still the regular occupation of men, but social customs and rules imposed by those having power gradually supplement primitive violence. Power is cruelly abused, but its advantages are so great that anarchy yields. Private wrongs are no longer privately avenged, but the state through law requires disputants to settle their controversies peaceably. Progress, however, is essential; some organ of change must be present so that the rights of individuals may be adjusted to meet altering social conditions. From this comes the whole development of parliamentary institutions, limitations on the power and privileges of king or nobles, increased power in the hands of all interested parties. Law, enforced when needful by the physical weapons of the sovereign state, makes this development relatively simple. As law-abiding habits develop, the resort to force becomes less essential; the mere existence of the rule of law suffices to regulate the conduct of the great mass of society without their ever being forced to obedience. At the present stage of our civilization no corresponding international development has taken place. It is true that wars have become less frequent, but they are more terrible. Preparation for war is a constant occupation of the great powers, and crushing armaments make armed peace more costly than war in an earlier age.

The horror of war is everywhere recognized, but if the will of the present generation is to be quickened to action it must never be permitted to escape from a vivid realization of what war means. In the nineteenth century there were nearly a score of great wars estimated to have cost nearly 5,000,000 lives and twenty billions of dollars. Our civil war cost nearly a half million lives and five billions of dollars, left the South desolate and put back its educational and economic progress many years. Within the year hundreds of thousands of Christians and Turks

have been slaughtered to the brutalization and degradation of all concerned. In every school in the land there should be a copy of Fritel's painting "The Conquerors,"—Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon,—riding between long lines of the outstretched dead, by whose lives their glory has been bought. The women and children whose husbands and fathers left home never to return are not shown.

"War
I abhor
And yet how sweet
The sound along the marching street
Of drum and fife! And I forget
Wet eyes of widows, and forget
Broken old mothers, and the whole
Dark butchery without a soul."

Upon those producers who remain, rests the burden of caring for dependents and disabled; they must labor to meet interest charges. Even in the United States nearly three-fourths of all our national expenditure has been directly or indirectly for military purposes. If the hundreds of millions being wasted to wage war and maintain armies and navies were otherwise utilized, how the period for education could be lengthened and educational facilities improved; the minimum wage problem eliminated; pensions for widows, invalids, and aged persons provided; the work-day shortened; the starving fed; art and literature and agricultural and industrial research stimulated; the battle for sanitation and the control of preventable diseases fought; in short, the whole program for social and industrial progress pushed forward with amazing rapidity. It is worth while to labor for peace.

How is the struggle against war to be conducted? What are the lines along which the era of peace is to be ushered in? It will be a long, hard struggle, in which every vulnerable spot should be assailed; the monster war should be repressed, made less brutal, less harmful to neutrals, a claw clipped here and a fang drawn there, but it is a struggle of extermination; war must ultimately be ended and the political brotherhood of man be realized in a federation of the world.

No generation is able to realize what mighty forces are working in it, but we may note certain influences which appear to make for world-peace.

The militaristic class has gradually lost influence and position. Young men of promise no longer look to war as the first career. They seek the more active life open to captains of industry or persons in the public service. Healthy public opinion will accelerate this movement. The people must strive to give the highest responsibility to men of peace; must put in places of leadership men who will understand their duty in influencing the ideals of thousands who look to them for guidance away from jingoism, false patriotism, and narrow antipathies to a sympathetic understanding of alien peoples; who will foster everywhere that feeling of good will which President Butler has called "the international mind."

Lovers of peace will look with favor upon all the agencies which tend to shape public opinion so that war will be distasteful and mutual good feeling natural. Nothing so dispels the prejudices of ignorance as light. Education all over the world brings with it a more intelligent appreciation of the ideas, customs, and purposes of foreign races and nations. Lecturers should be brought in numbers from foreign lands to dispel illusions as to their national life. Foreign travel is to be encouraged. If possible, such travel should be under conditions bringing the traveler into as close touch as possible with the actual life of the people in the lands visited.

The Christian Church has from the beginning sought to realize the brotherhood of the world. Whatever one's religious position may be, there is little doubt that foreign missionaries who go to their work with a true appreciation of the virtues of those to whom they are sent have performed, and are performing, an immense service in creating common world-wide standards of education and morals, as well as destroying the prejudices of ignorance. Who can tell what share in the renaissance of Japan is the part of devoted missionaries, or to what extent Robert College at Constantinople is responsible for the amazing development of Bulgaria.

International agencies are multiplying with great rapidity. The Union of International Associations was formed in 1910 at a congress representing 132 different international leagues, associations, or commissions.

The socialist party is a great political force working for peace. One of its fundamental positions is the unity of the working-class

throughout the world and the harmfulness of war to this class. How powerful is this influence is evident when one considers that there are now about 10,000,000 socialist voters. In the German Empire this is the strongest single party, having more than 4,000,000 voters and the largest number of members (110) in the lower house of the Imperial parliament, constantly on the alert to check militarism. One of these members, elected from the Emperor's own district, Potsdam, has recently made a sensational exposure of the heartless commercialism with which manufacturers of military supplies endeavor to inflame hostility in Germany and France. Last November, when it was feared the Balkan situation might provoke a general European war, there was in Paris a socialist demonstration in opposition to war participated in by 100,000 persons.

What is the duty of friends of peace? To act constantly on the basis that all men are brothers; to strive to reduce the differences between nations; differences in technical proficiency, in economic strength, in ethical ideals, to the end that, when public sentiment has reached the point where it insists that war must cease, conditions will be ripe for the substitution of other modes of action.

Needless wars of passion or pride should be prevented by friendly mediation, or at times intervention. International disputes involving questions which are capable of settlement on the basis of existing law should be determined judicially; precisely as they are between individuals. The splendid results accomplished by the two Hague conferences should be forwarded by the creation of a permanent judicial tribunal to adjudicate between nations. The Hague tribunal, established in 1899, has already passed upon eleven controversies, including the long standing dispute as to fisheries between Great Britain and the United States. These two great English speaking nations are about to complete the period of a hundred years of peace. If these nations can avoid war, with a great frontier between their territories and with keen commercial rivalries, is it too much to hope that wars between great civilized nations will soon be a thing of the past? For more than forty years there has been no war between the great Christian nations of Europe, and it seems improbable that the Franco-German war would have occurred save from the dynastic exigencies of the French Empire.

Winston Churchill, First Lord of the British Admiralty, sug-

gested to the House of Commons on March 26th that the nations construct no more dreadnaughts for a year. If we can get temporary respites from increase of armament, perhaps the Czar's hopes for relief from this burden may soon be realized.

War cannot be abolished by arbitration alone. The great fact of history is change. Law proceeds upon the assumption that the present status is just. There must, therefore, be some organ which will permit of international progress, where a hard and fast adherence to existing national rights would preclude progress. As races and nations change in size and strength, provisions as to immigration and commercial and territorial rights must be modified or war is inevitable. The final goal is a parliament of the world, founded upon a true international democracy, knowing no prejudices of race, religion or social position, in which the affairs of the world may be directed in the spirit of wisdom and justice. The lovers of peace may see a vision of a world from which war and its horrors are banished and in which the brotherhood of man is fact.

BOOK REVIEWS

GREEK IMPERIALISM. By William Scott Ferguson. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1913,—xiv, 258 pp.

The Greek cities, separated from one another geographically by mountain barriers and socially and religiously by differences of ancestry and worship, were unfitted by their nature and origin for union and consolidation into one large territorial state. They remained isolated city-states. In each the citizens were regarded as one large family sprung from a common ancestor to whom they paid divine honors, and they were therefore bound together by strong natural ties, those of kinship and religion. In proportion as this close relationship marked them as one people, it kept them apart from other city-states with different ancestors and a different worship. In such unfavorable soil it was with the utmost difficulty that the seeds of empire took root and grew. Nevertheless Sparta and Athens did establish empires, disguised though these were in their beginnings as leagues or federations of states joined together by treaties of alliance. The purpose in the formation of the Delian Confederacy, under Athenian leadership, became a pretext for its continuance after all fear of the Persians had vanished, and the sovereign state, Athens, used force when necessary to subdue the recalcitrant among the so-called allies. However objectionable to a city the overlordship of Athens or Sparta might be, far more hateful was the civil strife between the oligarchs and democrats with its attendant bloodshed that followed any attempt to throw off the yoke; submission to an imperial power was better than intestine war.

When in the course of time both empires fell, the city-states were again free, though robbed of their vitality. Then Macedon stepped in, and by diplomacy and conquest brought all Greece into subjection. Alexander the Great united the city-states in one great territorial state—a marvelous achievement. He did it by requiring them to recognize him as a god. With this in mind, seven years before he had marched through the Sahara to the remote oracle of the Egyptian Ammon in order that he might be greeted by the priests as the son of Zeus. Now as a god he had the right to command, and the city-states in obeying their own

deity were not obeying the commands of a foreigner. The Ptolemies and Seleucids likewise posed as god-kings. "Deification of rulers did the impossible: it reconciled completely the antinomy between city-state and imperialism."

In "Greek Imperialism" Professor Ferguson has given to the public his Lowell lectures of last February. The book is scholarly, well written, and full of interest. In the empires of Sparta, Athens, Alexander, the Ptolemies, Seleucids, and Antigonids, which he passes successively in review, he shows that there was a continuous constitutional development from the city-state in its earliest form to the territorial state as we find it in the Aetolian or the Achaean League, "the most perfect state which antiquity produced." Such leagues or federations of city-states with equal rights the Greeks formed in the third century when they at length fully realized the necessity for union and concerted action for the defense of their liberties. Thus the deification of rulers, and these federal unions, together effected the transformation of city-states into territorial states.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER.

THE REPUBLIC. A Little Book of Homespun Verse. By Madison Cawein. Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd Company, 1913,—98 pp.

While the South is busy scolding Brander Matthews and other critics for failure to give her nineteenth-century writers due recognition, I find it rather strange that she does not turn her attention for a moment to the present day and advance the claim—a very reasonable claim—that Madison Cawein, of Kentucky, is the best American poet now living. I make this remark apropos of the fact that Mr. Cawein's new collection, "The Republic, A Little Book of Homespun Verse", has just been published.

As "The Republic" contains but ninety-eight pages, it is a much more slender volume than we are accustomed to expect from Mr. Cawein. It is, however, large enough and comprehensive enough to include most of the well-known Cawein moods. Here, as in past collections, we find richly imaged nature poems, melodious lyrics, well-drawn sketches of various Kentucky types, and simple (and sometimes rather commonplace) poems of homely life.

The title poem, "The Republic", is an irregular patriotic ode in nine parts. It is not a strikingly original piece, either in matter

or in manner. When Mr. Cawein gravely tells us that what we Americans need is more art and less haste, he is telling us something that has been painfully obvious to all thinking people for goodness knows how long. But, after all, there is no great harm in repeating proverbs, when one can do it as musically, eloquently, and impressively as Mr. Cawein does it here. "The Republic" is undoubtedly one of the best American odes that has appeared since Lowell's "Commemoration" ode.

A number of other poems in the new Cawein volume are worthy of special mention. "Mirage", a bit of tragedy, is one of the most powerful things Mr. Cawein has ever done. "The Call of April" is a delightful lyric with an irresistibly winsome refrain. "The Menace" is a tremendous picture of that unspeakable crime which makes the race problem such a serious one in the South. "Kentucky", an occasional poem, is a beautiful tribute to the author's native state. And "Corncob Jones" is a droll, very life-like piece in a James Whitcomb Riley vein.

"The Republic" may not add appreciably to Mr. Cawein's reputation, but at any rate it should go far toward disproving the theory that his work is seriously declining.

H. HOUSTON PECKHAM.

THE CITY CHURCH AND ITS SOCIAL MISSION. A Series of Studies in the Social Extension of the City Church. By A. M. Trawick, Secretary Student Department International Y. M. C. A. Association Press: New York and London, 1913,—viii, 166 pp.

The nature and scope of this book is well indicated in the title and sub-title. In a series of six studies the author discusses, with considerable detail, the following topics: The City Church and Family Life; The City Church and Public Care of Children; The City Church and the Problem of Charity; The City Church and the Labor Problem; The City Church and Social Vice; The City Church and Other Religious Agencies.

The author does not undertake to prove that the church has a social mission. He points out the most striking social evils of the cities and indicates how the churches may work towards the amelioration or removal of these evils. The fact that the evils are there and that the church is an organized social body, animated by religious motives, is a sufficient call to the duty of doing something.

Mr. Trawick does not lose sight of the primary purpose of Christianity in its central mission to the spiritual nature of men. For example, in treating the question of social vice he fully recognizes the necessity for the spiritual regeneration of the individual sinner, but at the same time he indicates how traffic in virtue may be restricted and the conditions of temptation reduced, if not removed. It is difficult to see why prevention of vice is not quite as spiritual a mission as the rescue of the lost. In discussing the complex question of poverty, the author does not discredit the superior motive of the church in dispensing charity but suggests that the scientific study of the causes and conditions of poverty may lead to measures that will help to reduce the causes. In each study the first thing insisted on is a thorough investigation of the facts. The lack of knowledge of real conditions is the chief cause of inactivity or apathy upon the part of church people. Secure rational investigation of local conditions, and the facts elicited will stimulate sympathy and a sense of obligation.

The book is free from extreme statements, and most of the suggestions and methods of study and work are practicable, though there are some that have a rather wide range, involving questions which can be settled only by legislative action and a larger public opinion than the individual church can control. Taken as a whole, the volume is an excellent text book for pastors and church workers and can be useful to any person interested in the great social and moral problems of the cities. Each study is supplemented by a "reading list" and series of fifteen or twenty questions on the text. The book closes with a fairly complete bibliography. These features make the volume especially serviceable in the hands of organized classes who are in training for special work along social lines.

FRANKLIN N. PARKER.

ALMS FOR OBLIVION. By Pegram Dargan. Printed for the author by L. Graham Co., Ltd., New Orleans, 1913,—372 pp.

In "Alms for Oblivion," a volume of satiric poetry, there are some commendable features. For example, there is evidenced here by the author a brisk, emphatic, spirited way of expressing his likes and dislikes; an intense loyalty to his country (or rather

a certain section of his country); and a wide reading along lines historic and literary. Mr. Dargan's extensive reading is shown by the fact that he alludes to such widely different personages as Homer, Pope, Mrs. Pankhurst, E. H. Sothern, Carrie Nation, Jacob A. Riis, and bumptious Ben Butler.

As poetry, and as an expression of true Southern sentiment, "Alms for Oblivion" is not a success; but as a striking combination of balderdash, vulgarity, and blasphemy, it can scarcely be surpassed. Mr. Dargan must have obtained his ideas of refinement from such writers as Aristophanes, Chaucer, and some of the Restoration poets and dramatists; but the delicious humor of Aristophanes and Chaucer, and the polish of such Restoration authors as Butler and Dryden and Congreve, is sadly lacking in his work.

Of the external form of "Alms for Oblivion," he it said that its metres amble along with the gracefulness of a Vulcan or a Lord Dorincourt, and that its most characteristic rimes would make Mrs. Browning blush in her most careless moments. Here are a few of Mr. Dargan's iambic pentameters:

"She claimed, and still the like she claimed."

"No 'good night', for thee or for Marmion."

"As his by edict ordered never to be spoken."

"The market's doubtful and dull the season."

And here are a few sample rimes: "book-Hook (ham)", "landed-planned it", "uncivil-devil", "sucks-pukes", "draughts-halves", "scratch-itch", "sicken-bacon", "eager-nigger". However, part of these crudities may be pardoned, since Mr. Dargan is apparently trying to ape the whimsicalities of Samuel Butler and other burlesque poets.

Mr. Dargan did a wise and considerate thing when he bestowed his "Alms" upon Oblivion. Fame will never be disposed to quarrel with Oblivion for possession of the gift, and, moreover, the gift can do Oblivion no harm.

H. HOUSTON PECKHAM.

THE RELATIONS OF LATIN AND ENGLISH DURING THE AGE OF MILTON. By Weldon T. Myers. Ruebush-Elkins Company, Dayton, Virginia,—166 pp.

This study combines in convenient compass some important facts presented in a pleasant style of writing too frequently neg-

lected by authors of dissertations. It does not, however, make any material addition to the student's knowledge of the subject. The conclusions reached are very general and have previously been stated in fairly accessible works which are considered authoritative. Further research might confirm, or possibly correct, these by a minute examination of the great body of Latin literature produced in the seventeenth century. Dr. Myers, however, makes no such examination; he is usually content candidly to adopt the utterances of previous commentators. In section I, chapter III, for example, the use of Latin in stage performances at the universities before the Restoration is illustrated by only six examples, concerning which the information offered is based on references to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Ward's *History of the English Drama*, Masson's *Life of Milton*, and H. C. Cooper's *Annals of Cambridge*. Referring to conditions after the Restoration, the author adds that "both English and Latin plays returned in full force to the academic stage," and cites as authority the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The prevalence of this second-hand method throughout is indicated by the scarcity of original material included in the bibliography and by the presence of about one hundred and twenty references to Masson's *Life of Milton*.

Dr. Myers has given us a practical resumé but has made no distinct contribution to scholarship.

C. A. MOORE.

ESTHER WAKE, OR THE SPIRIT OF THE REGULATORS. A play in four acts.

By A. Vermont. Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton Printing Company, 1913,—74 pp.

The four act play "Esther Wake, or The Spirit of the Regulators," was written by Mr. A. Vermont, Superintendent of the Smithfield schools, for the Summer School Dramatic Club of the University of North Carolina, and it was performed by the club on the university campus in July, 1912. At this performance the play was received quite favorably. Such an attempt to utilize the colonial history of the state is noteworthy. Mr. Vermont deserves the thanks of us all for this sort of pioneer work in a field of writing little essayed in our section of the country. With proper encouragement and support he may achieve success, as he

will no doubt profit from the opportunity of seeing his play performed under such favorable circumstances.

We have not the space here to discuss the play at length either from the standpoint of its historical background or of its technical or artistic merits. Judged from either of these standpoints, it does not deserve great praise. It certainly does not correctly represent the "spirit of the Regulators;" it confuses that spirit with the moving spirit of the Revolution. Pugh is quite evidently not a Regulator, but rather the type of North Carolinian who, siding with Tryon against the Regulation, later became the promoter of the Revolution. The shameful treatment accorded the messengers of Tryon by the Regulators just before the battle of Alamance is passed over without mention, while the Governor is made to murder a messenger of the Americans before the battle. Besides, both in diction and style the author fails to effect the illusion desired. For example, the frequent use of the word *fiancé* and its feminine form jars painfully on one's sense of the fitness of things. Such a reference as that on page 29 to Yale University is disastrous.

In plot the play is not lacking in interest; the story holds one's attention, though its conclusion is not satisfying. Also it is so thought out as to provide for dramatic possibilities. But, as a play, it is poorly constructed. There is a most evident lack of skilful motivation. For example, how did Pugh happen to be just at the river during the storm when Esther needed to be rescued? And, technically considered, Pugh is the hero of the play, since it is he rather than Esther who is the moving spirit of it.

The book is neatly printed and bound. A few misprints occur. The punctuation, however, is very bad.

W. H. WANNAMAKER.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MISSISSIPPI HISTORICAL SOCIETY. Volume XIII.
Edited by Franklin L. Riley, University, Mississippi, 1913,—326 pp.

The Mississippi Historical Society has for many years been a leader in the intensive study of state history. The present volume marks the continuance of the unique undertaking begun in volume X, the study of the reconstruction period in Mississippi by counties. The counties treated are Panola and Oktibbeha, in which the negro population was greater than the white, and La-

fayette and Scott in which the whites had a majority. The essays are the results of investigations at the University of Mississippi under the direction of Professor Franklin L. Riley. Uniform treatment is followed. After an introductory survey of resources and *ante bellum* history, sections are devoted in each essay to party and party principles, party leaders, political and semi-political organizations, county government, the judiciary, campaign and election methods, social conditions, religious affairs, economic changes, labor, taxation, education, bibliography, and statistics.

Such studies have a general as well as a local value. They convey an impression of the reconstruction process at short range, show how conditions varied in different parts of the same state, clarify the perplexing question of local taxation and county debts, and give concrete illustrations of economic and social transformations. If similar studies of typical counties in other states could be made, there would be a basis for a regional or cross sectional survey of reconstruction, which alone will give a satisfactory solution to the many political, economic, and social problems of the period.

WILLIAM K. BOYD.

HISTORY OF THE CHEMICAL BANK, 1823-1913. Privately printed. New York, 1913,—xiv, 167 pp.

The Chemical National Bank of New York is one of the most famous and successful financial institutions of the country. This history recounts from an inside point of view the facts of its long and extremely solvent career. Its solvency makes a deep impression when one reads that its stock of \$100 par value sold for \$4900 a share in 1895. The dividend rate was then 150 per cent a year. In 1907 the capital stock was increased from \$300,000 to \$3,000,000 by dividend from the surplus, giving each shareholder ten shares instead of each one share previously held.

The first part of the volume is devoted to a history of the bank's career in its relation to the financial history of the country, and especially to its honorable record in the financial storms of 1837, 1857, and 1873, as well as in the Civil War. There are sketches of the men who made the Chemical Bank in the second part of

the volume, and a third part takes up the various homes and surroundings of the institution.

The work has been tastefully printed for the bank by Doubleday, Page and Company. It is profusely illustrated with both half tones and line cuts of scenes, men, and documents of significance in the history of the institution. Some of the most interesting pictures are the early scenes in New York, taken from the archives of the bank. Also there are pictures of some of the bank's early currency, checks and certificates of deposit.

AFRICAN CAMP FIRES. By Stewart Edward White. Illustrated from photographs. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, Page and Company, 1913,—xiii, 378 pp., \$1.50 net.

Mr. White's two trips to Africa have thus far resulted in the publication of "In the Land of Footprints" and "African Camp Fires." Both of these volumes are largely devoted to adventures in big game hunting vividly related. Fortunately they contain much more. After reading exactly how lion after lion—not to speak of lesser beasts—succumbed to the author's prowess, there comes a time when the reader has a surfeit of animal killing. At this point chapters on the peoples of Africa, the customs, travel adventures, and the many beauties of nature, afford a welcome variety.

"African Camp Fires" possesses great charm and value as a travel book by a skilled observer and delightful writer. The narrative is supplemented by many excellent reproductions from photographs. A vein of humor runs through the volume and is never long lost from sight. Occasionally Mr. White uncovers a pay streak of exceptional richness. His keen observation of the customs and social organization of the native races is best illustrated in the "Notes on the Masai." Vegetarians will be surprised to learn that the Masai live almost exclusively on "mixed cow's blood and milk—no fruits, no vegetables, no grains, rarely flesh." Yet among the southern branch of the race "men close to seven feet in height are not at all uncommon, and the average is well above six." They are a brown people of imposing and pleasing physical appearance; they perform no agriculture whatever; the task of caring for their immense herds of cattle is as-

signed to the boys and the youths. "Therefore the grown men are absolutely and completely gentlemen of leisure. In civilization, the less men do the more important they are inclined to think themselves. It is so here. Socially the Masai consider themselves several cuts above anybody in the country. As social superiority lies mostly in thinking so hard enough—so that the inner belief expresses itself in the outward attitude and manner—the Masai carry it off. Their haughtiness is magnificent. Also they can look as unsmiling and bored as anybody anywhere. Consequently they are either greatly admired; or greatly hated and feared, as the case happens to be, by all the other tribes." Mr. White, however, points out that no matter how arrogantly the Masai bear themselves toward the surrounding tribes, they show a great shrewdness in keeping on good terms with the English whose strength they have seen demonstrated in wars with neighboring peoples.

W. H. G.

REVERIES IN RHYME. By Hersey Everett Spence. Durham, North Carolina: Durham Book and Stationery Company, 1913,—120 pp. \$1.00.

This volume comprises sixty-seven short poems, grouped under the headings, *Poems of Childhood and Country Life*, *Songs of the Seasons*, *Love Lyrics*, *Odds and Ends*. Most of the poems have appeared in various magazines and newspapers. Although the volume is not large, the bulk of the work is considerable for a poet yet so young, and the book makes a very attractive appearance.

As might be expected in the work of a comparatively young writer, the technique is very unequal throughout the collection, and along with quite satisfactory stanzas one finds lines and whole stanzas which are halting in movement and crude in form; but the writer is pleasingly naïve, and he often attains ease and facility worthy of a poet of much more experience.

In the somewhat wide range of subjects handled in the book Mr. Spence has shown himself a close and sympathetic observer of human nature and of external nature, and although some of the poems give the impression of having been written without any purpose other than that of mere practice, the poet often depicts

the primal moods and passions of mankind with pleasing fidelity. Especially is this true in some of his poems which deal with childhood, such as "The Old Pear Tree," "The Old Hobby," "Paper Folks," "The Red Stick of Candy," and "The Land of Make-Believe," and in those which portray the elements of negro character, such as "De Onliest Chune," "De Fust Sin." The last two illustrate the poet's successful handling of the negro dialect.

While Mr. Spence has not yet shown himself impressed with any great purpose in his work, he has handled astutely the artificialities and excrescences of modern society in a humorous way and in a fine spirit of playfulness, generally the most effective manner; the buoyant, hopeful spirit and the healthy optimism pervading all his work make his poems pleasing and refreshing reading.

F. C. BROWN.

THE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF THE BAPTISTS AND FIFTH MONARCHY MEN IN ENGLAND DURING THE INTERREGNUM. By Louise Fargo Brown. Washington: American Historical Association. London: Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, 1912,—xi., 258 pp. \$1.50.

In this monograph, which was awarded the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize in European History for 1911 by the American Historical Association, the author has undertaken the somewhat difficult task of ascertaining the part played in British politics in this troublous period by the parties named in the title. She insists at the outset that, while Fifth Monarchy Men were recruited from the Baptists to a larger extent than from any other sect, nevertheless, the two parties are distinct and ought not to be confused with each other, as some less careful writers have done in the past. The English Baptists, the author traces to their well known beginnings in the early part of the seventeenth century as an offshoot of the English Separatist churches in Holland. The Fifth Monarchy Men, she maintains, were members of various dissenting churches, with which they might continue to affiliate after they had joined this party. The chief point in the creed of this party seems to have rested on a peculiar interpretation of certain passages in the Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse. It was alleged that, according to these prophecies, three of the monarchies of the world, the Assyrian, Persian, and Greek, had

already passed into history. The fourth, the Roman, was rapidly passing, as was indicated by the troubles in England and on the Continent. The time was, therefore, close at hand when Christ should come to inaugurate the fifth monarchy of the millennium. Holding these views, the Fifth Monarchy Men naturally looked upon Cromwell as a usurper and gave him much trouble. After his death they were instrumental in securing the recall of the rump of the Long Parliament and thus, unwittingly, in promoting the return of the Stuart monarchy.

The author has conned with remarkable patience the voluminous pages of Thurloe and the contemporary pamphlets. Since her material was largely of this character, however, it was all the more difficult to use, and one is not always convinced beyond doubt or peradventure of the truth of some of the statements which she makes as facts. Nevertheless, the author illuminates many obscure points, and her monograph is not the least meritorious volume in the series in which it is published.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

THE DOMINIE OF HARLEM. By Arnold Mulder. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1913,—385 pp. \$1.25 net.

In his novel, "The Dominie of Harlem," Arnold Mulder goes to fresh woods and pastures new for his material. He takes us to the Dutch section of western Michigan, a region hitherto unexplored by the writer of fiction.

"The Dominie of Harlem" is a gripping tale of the conflict between the old and the new, the war between fogysm and modern progress. Dominie Van Weelen, a young clergyman with university training, high ideals, and abundant enthusiasm, comes to minister to a rural community where a Dutch God is worshipped, and where the favorite reading is Dutch polemic theology. To teach the people of this community that altruism and rational, sanitary living are as important as orthodoxy in the faith—to redeem, in short, "the slums of the country"—is the task to which the young preacher devotes himself. He finds an admirable helpmate in the person of Nellie Harmdyk, a beautiful girl born and reared in this quaint community, but broadened by a college education. The plot is greatly strengthened by the fact

that no member of the community is more fogyish or more obstinate in his fogyism than Nellie's father, Jan Harmdyk.

"The Dominic of Harlem" deserves notable success; for it is a remarkable tale, uncommonly well told. It is replete with Dutch atmosphere, but at no time does the dialect become cloying or unintelligible.

H. HOUSTON PECKHAM.





